

Mr. SKUBITZ. Mr. Speaker, this week the U.S. Department of Agriculture reported that the Commodity Credit Corporation had acquired \$1.369 billion worth of farm commodities from July 1, 1964, through January 1965. During this same 7-month period, CCC disposed of inventories valued at \$1.247 billion.

This tremendous turnover of Government-owned farm surpluses is costly, wasteful, and destructive of free market prices received by farmers for the products they sell in direct competition with CCC offerings. Currently we have substantial surpluses of wheat, corn, and a variety of agricultural commodities. Whenever CCC sells a bushel of grain, it displaces a bushel which would otherwise be marketed by a producer. The result is that for each of these bushels which CCC moves out of inventory through the front door, it acquires through the back door an equivalent amount under the loan storage program.

The in and out charges, the acquisition costs, the transportation expenses involved here are enormous. Moreover, the dumping of CCC-owned commodities depresses the free market prices upon which farmers depend for their principal source of income. The Government loses, the farmer loses. I have today introduced legislation which would prohibit CCC after July 1, 1965, from "making any sales—except sales offset by equivalent purchases—of wheat, corn, oats, rye, barley, grain sorghums, soybeans, or flaxseed at less than 125 percent of the current support price for any such commodity, plus reasonable carrying charges."

During 1965 at the peak of the wheat marketing season, CCC sold millions of bushels of wheat in direct competition with producer marketings, thus penalizing the farmer who signed up for the program as well as the ones who did not. Since October 1, the beginning of the corn marketing year, CCC has sold about 200 million bushels of corn in competition with farmer marketings.

The restrictions on CCC sales which I am proposing would not only result in substantial savings to the Government, but it would also increase the free market prices for corn, wheat, grain, sorghums and other commodities by at least 10 to 20 cents per bushel.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 32]

Ashbrook	Farnum	McEwen
Ashley	Friedel	Martin, Mass.
Blatnik	Glaimo	Martin, Nebr.
Brademas	Gibbons	Morrison
Collier	Hagan, Ga.	Morton
Conable	Hanna	Multer
Corman	Hansen, Idaho	Nix
Dawson	Harvey, Ind.	Powell
Diggs	Holland	Roberts
Edwards, Calif.	Irwin	Roosevelt

Roybal	Teague, Tex.	Watkins
Scott	Thompson, La.	Widnall
Secrest	Toll	Wright
Sickles	Utt	Wylder

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall, 389 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

NEW HOUSE GYMNASIUM

(Mr. HARRIS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to remind all Members of the House that this afternoon we will officially open and have ready for use the new House gymnasium. You received a notice from the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CEDERBERG] and me as members of the gym committee about 2 weeks ago.

The gymnasium will be opened at 4:30 p.m. and at 5 o'clock sharp there will be a brief ceremony at which time we will give special recognition to our beloved and esteemed colleague, the gentleman from Texas, ALBERT THOMAS, who has been chairman of the gym committee now for many years—almost 20 years I suppose.

For those Members who perhaps do not know where the gymnasium is located, if you will go to the subbasement in the Rayburn Building and enter from the Independence Street side, where the four elevators are, it is on the east end of that corridor; or, if you wish to go from the Longworth Building, if you go down the escalator you will be on the subbasement floor and can go around the corridor to the south side of that first corridor, where you will find the entrance to the new gymnasium.

The entire facilities of the old gymnasium are being transferred to the new one. This is for all Members of the House.

The program at 5 o'clock will be brief, and I know all Members will want to take a good look at this new facility for the health and welfare of the Members of the House. Everyone is urged to use these facilities. The use will be good for all of us.

We invite you to come. We hope you will be there for this occasion. I know you want to join in paying special recognition to our colleague the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS].

TO AUTHORIZE PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF HOUSE DOCUMENT NO. 103, 86TH CONGRESS

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up House Concurrent Resolution 7 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. CON. RES. 7

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring). That there shall be printed an additional thirteen thousand five hundred and fifty copies of House Document Numbered 103 of the Eighty-sixth Congress in the style and format directed by the Joint

Committee on Printing; two thousand five hundred and seventy-five of such copies shall be for the use of the Senate and ten thousand nine hundred and seventy-five of such copies shall be for the use of the House of Representatives.

With the following committee amendment:

Following line 7, insert line 8: "Sec. 2. Copies of such document shall be prorated to Members of the Senate and House of Representatives for a period of sixty days, after which the unused balance shall revert to the respective Senate and House Document Rooms."

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HAYS] is recognized.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. There is nothing in the concurrent resolution to indicate the nature of the document. Would the gentleman state the nature of the material to be printed.

Mr. HAYS. It is a flat, semihard sheet of paper, about the size of the tablet I am holding, containing a code of ethics for Government employees, drawn up some years ago, which was printed once and for which there seems to be some demand for reprinting. It is used for hanging in Government buildings where Government employees work.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PRINTING OF THE PROCEEDINGS IN CONNECTION WITH THE ACCEPTANCE OF THE STATUE OF THE LATE SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, SAM RAYBURN OF TEXAS

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up House Concurrent Resolution 83 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. CON. RES. 83

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring). That the proceedings at the presentation, dedication, and acceptance of the statue of Sam Rayburn, presented by the Texas State Society in the Rayburn Building, together with appropriate illustrations and other pertinent matter, shall be printed as a House document. The copy for such House document shall be prepared under the supervision of the Joint Committee on Printing.

SEC. 2. There shall be printed five thousand additional copies of such House document, which shall be bound in such style as the Joint Committee on Printing shall direct, and of which one hundred copies shall be for the use of the Senate and five hundred copies shall be for the use of the House of Representatives, and four thousand four hundred copies shall be for the use of the Members of the Senate and the Members of the House of Representatives from the State of Texas.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 1, strike out lines 9 through 12.
On page 2, strike out lines 1 through 5, and add the following:

"Sec. 2. There shall be printed ten thousand additional copies of such House document, which shall be bound in such style as the Joint Committee on Printing shall direct, of which one thousand copies shall be for the use of the Senate and nine thousand copies shall be for the use of the House of Representatives, to be prorated for a period of sixty days, after which the unused balance shall revert to the respective Senate and House Document Rooms."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TO AUTHORIZE THE PRINTING AS A HOUSE DOCUMENT THE PAMPHLET ENTITLED "OUR AMERICAN GOVERNMENT. WHAT IS IT? HOW DOES IT FUNCTION?"

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, by the direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up House Concurrent Resolution 97 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. CON. RES. 97

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That (a) with the permission of the copyright owner of the book "Our American Government—1001 Questions on How It Works," with answers by Wright Patman, published by Scholastic Magazines, Incorporated, there shall be printed as a House document the pamphlet entitled "Our American Government. What Is It? How Does It Function?"; and that there shall be printed one million eighty-four thousand additional copies of such document, of which two hundred and six thousand copies shall be for the use of the Senate, and eight hundred and seventy-eight thousand copies shall be for the use of the House of Representatives.

With the following committee amendment:

Following line 12, add the following:

"Sec. 2. Copies of such document shall be prorated to Members of the Senate and House of Representatives for a period of sixty days, after which the unused balance shall revert to the respective Senate and House Document Rooms."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PRINTING OF INAUGURAL ADDRESSES FROM PRESIDENT WASHINGTON TO PRESIDENT JOHNSON

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up House Concurrent Resolution 125, with a committee amendment, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. CON. RES. 125

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That a collection of inaugural addresses, from President George Washington to President Lyndon B. Johnson, compiled from research volumes and State papers by the Legislative Reference Service, Library of Congress, be printed with illustrations as a House document; and that sixteen thousand one hundred and twenty-five additional copies be printed, of which ten thousand nine hundred and seventy-five copies shall be for the use of the House of Representatives, and five thousand one hundred and fifty copies for the use of the Senate.

With the following committee amendment:

Following line 11, insert the following:

"Sec. 2. Copies of such document shall be prorated to Members of the Senate and House of Representatives for a period of sixty days, after which the unused balance shall revert to the respective Senate and House Document Rooms."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PRINTING OF TRIBUTES BY MEMBERS OF CONGRESS TO THE LATE SIR WINSTON CHURCHILL

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up House Concurrent Resolution 153 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. CON. RES. 153

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That there be printed with illustrations as a House document all remarks by Members of the Senate and House of Representatives in the Halls of Congress which constitute tributes to the life, character, and public service of the late Sir Winston Churchill. The copy for such House document shall be prepared under the supervision of the Joint Committee on Printing.

Sec. 2. In addition to the usual number, there shall be printed five thousand eight hundred and sixty additional copies of such House document, of which one thousand and five hundred copies shall be for the use of the Senate, and four thousand three hundred and sixty copies shall be for the use of the House of Representatives.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REPRINTING OF HOUSE DOCUMENT NO. 103, 88TH CONGRESS

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up House Concurrent Resolution 165, with committee amendments, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. CON. RES. 165

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the brochure entitled "How Our Laws Are Made", by Doctor Charles J. Zinn, law revision counsel of the House of Representatives Committee on the Judiciary, as set out in House Document

Numbered 103 of the Eighty-eighth Congress, be printed as a House document, with emendations by the author and with a foreword by Honorable Edwin E. Willis; and that there be printed one hundred thirty-two thousand additional copies to be prorated to the Members of the House of Representatives for a period of ninety days after which the unused balance shall revert to the Committee on the Judiciary.

With the following committee amendments:

On line 11, strike out "ninety" and insert "sixty"

On line 12, strike out "Committee on the Judiciary" and insert "House Document Room".

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PRINTING OF STUDY OF COMPENSATION AND ASSISTANCE FOR PERSONS AFFECTED BY REAL PROPERTY ACQUISITION IN FEDERAL PROGRAMS

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up House Concurrent Resolution 167 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. CON. RES. 167

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That there be printed for the use of the Committee on Public Works, House of Representatives, one thousand additional copies of a study made by that committee of compensation and assistance for persons affected by real property acquisition in Federal and federally assisted programs.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PUBLICATION OF DEPARTMENT OF STATE WHITE PAPER RELATING TO NORTH VIETNAM

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up House Concurrent Resolution 338, with a committee amendment, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. CON. RES. 338

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That (a) there be printed as a House document the Department of State white paper, issued February 17, 1965, relating to North Vietnam's campaign to conquer South Vietnam (Department of State Publication 7839). The copy for such House document shall be prepared under the supervision of the Joint Committee on Printing.

(b) In addition to the usual number, there shall be printed sixty-three thousand six hundred additional copies of such House document of which twenty thousand shall be for the use of the Senate, and forty-three thousand six hundred for the use of the House of Representatives.

With the following committee amendment:

Following line 12, insert:

"Sec. 2. Copies of such document shall be prorated to Members of the Senate and House of Representatives for a period of sixty days, after which the unused balance shall revert to the respective Senate and House Document Rooms".

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman if it is the common precept and tradition that we print these in the Congress rather than have the Department downtown print such a document and distribute it? I have no objection to this, but I am just seeking information.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, may I say that the Department printed a number of these and made them available to the Members of the House; but the demand has gone beyond that. This has been done in the past and I may point out that this does not necessarily represent the views of the House of Representatives, but is a Department of State compilation.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the statement of the gentleman and thank him.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the author of this resolution, the gentleman from New York [Mr. TENZER], I ask unanimous consent that he may extend his remarks following the passage of the concurrent resolution just agreed to.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. TENZER. Mr. Speaker, I want to compliment the gentleman from Ohio, Mr. WAYNE L. HAYS, the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Printing of the Committee on House Administration, for the expeditious manner in which his committee dealt with House Concurrent Resolution 338. Chairman HAYS and the distinguished gentleman from Texas, Mr. OMAR BURLESON, chairman of the Committee on House Administration, together with the members of the full committee and the Subcommittee on Printing have shown not only a recognition of the bipartisan aspects of our Vietnam commitment, but also a desire to insure the continuation of such bipartisan support by making certain that the American people are kept aware of the underlying reasons and the facts which justify this country's commitment.

The white paper does not offer a solution to the Vietnam conflict, but it does set forth in clear and concise form the case against Communist aggression in South Vietnam. This document provides the facts so that American citizens may judge the reasons for our role there and the future course of our defense of freedom in that area of the globe.

My colleagues in giving unanimous approval of the resolution have likewise acted expeditiously in this matter of great importance to our democratic form

of government and the American people will be fully apprised of all the facts.

PRINTING THE PRAYERS OF THE HOUSE CHAPLAIN

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration I call up House Resolution 230 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 230

Resolved, That the prayers offered by the Chaplain, the Reverend Bernard Braskamp, doctor of divinity, at the opening of the daily sessions of the House of Representatives of the United States during the Eighty-seventh and Eighty-eighth Congresses, be printed as a House document, and that two thousand additional copies be printed and bound for the use of the House of Representatives, to be distributed by the Chaplain of the House of Representatives.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 1, line 6, strike out "two" and insert "one"

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PRAYERS OFFERED BY CHAPLAIN OF U.S. SENATE

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up Senate Concurrent Resolution 9 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

S. CON. RES. 9

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed thirty-two thousand two hundred and fifty additional copies of Senate Document Numbered 86, Eighty-first Congress, first session, being the prayers offered by the Chaplain, the Reverend Peter Marshall, doctor of divinity, at the opening of the daily sessions of the Senate of the United States during the Eightieth and Eighty-first Congresses, 1947-1949; of which ten thousand three hundred copies shall be for the use of the Senate and twenty-one thousand nine hundred and fifty copies shall be for the use of the House of Representatives.

The resolution was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

STUDIES AND INVESTIGATIONS BY COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up House Resolution 152, with committee amendments, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That, effective January 4, 1965, the expenses of the studies and investigations to be conducted pursuant to H. Res. 151 by the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed \$75,000, including expenditures for the employment of investigators, attorneys, and experts, and clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, and all expenses necessary for travel and subsistence incurred by members and employees while

engaged in the activities of the committee or any subcommittee thereof, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized and signed by the chairman of such committee and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

Sec. 2. The chairman, with the consent of the head of the department or agency concerned, is authorized and empowered to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any other departments or agencies of the Government.

Sec. 3. The official committee reporters may be used at all hearings held in the District of Columbia, if not otherwise officially engaged.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 5, strike out "\$75,000" and insert "\$50,000".

Page 2, following line 10, insert line 11, "Sec. 4. No part of the funds authorized by this resolution shall be available for expenditure in connection with the study or investigation of any subject which is being investigated for the same purpose by any other committee of the House, and the chairman of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries shall furnish the Committee on House Administration information with respect to any study or investigation intended to be financed from such funds."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES TO EMPLOY THREE ADDITIONAL EMPLOYEES

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration I call up House Resolution 248 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That, effective March 1, 1965, the Committee on Armed Services is authorized, until otherwise provided by law, to employ three additional employees, one professional and two clerical, at rates of compensation to be fixed by the chairman in accordance with section 202 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING THE EXPENDITURE OF MONEYS TO COVER EXPENSES OF THE COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY INCURRED PURSUANT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 133

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration I call up House Resolution 247, with sundry committee amendments, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That effective from January 3, 1965, the expenses of conducting the studies, investigations, and inquiries authorized by H. Res. 133, Eighty-ninth Congress, incurred by the Committee on Banking and Currency acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed \$200,000 \$150,000, including expenditures for employment, travel, and subsistence of attorneys, accountants, experts, investigators, and clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, with respect to any matter or matters in the field of housing coming

within the jurisdiction of such committee or subcommittee, including, but not limited to, (1) the status and adequacy of mortgage credit in the United States, (2) the terms and availability of conventional mortgage financing, (3) the flow of savings in relation to home financing needs, (4) the operation of the various Government-assisted housing programs, (5) the current rate of construction of residential dwelling units in relation to housing requirements and demands, (6) the role of housing construction in the national economy, (7) the requirement of and demand for Federal assistance in the development of community facilities, including mass transportation and other related facilities, (8) urban and suburban problems, including transportation facilities, as they affect the availability of adequate housing, (9) the operation of the slum clearance and urban renewal programs, and (10) rural housing and the adequacy of rural housing credit, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by such committee or subcommittee signed by the chairman of such committee or subcommittee and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

SEC. 2. No part of the funds authorized by this resolution shall be available for expenditure in connection with the study or investigation of any subject which is being investigated for the same purpose by any other committee of the House, and the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency shall furnish the Committee on House Administration information with respect to any study or investigation intended to be financed from such funds.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 4, after the word "Currency" insert "acting as a whole or by subcommittee,".

Page 1, line 5, strike out "\$200,000" and insert "\$150,000".

Page 1, line 9, following the word "Committee" insert "or subcommittee,".

Page 2, line 14, following the word "committee" insert "or subcommittee,".

Page 2, line 15, following the word "committee" insert "or subcommittee,".

Mr. WAGGONER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana, a member of the committee.

Mr. WAGGONER. Could the gentleman from Ohio clarify for the Members of the House who under the amended language of this resolution is entitled or authorized to sign the necessary vouchers?

Mr. HAYS. May I say to the gentleman from Louisiana that this is exactly the same resolution, insofar as the committee or subcommittee language is concerned, that the House reported 2 years ago.

The Committee on House Administration, I believe it is fair to say, did not feel that we could arbitrate within the Committee on Banking and Currency. They worked this matter out themselves 2 years ago.

The Committee on House Administration does feel that the Housing Subcommittee is a very important subcommittee and that it should be separately financed and that the money should be used for that purpose.

I would interpret the language to read that if the work is done by the full committee then, of course, the chairman of the full committee would have the re-

sponsibility of signing the vouchers, and if it is done by the subcommittee, then according to the language as I see it, either the chairman or the subcommittee chairman could sign the vouchers, subject to approval of the Committee on House Administration.

Mr. WAGGONER. I thank the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. PATMAN. I differ with the gentleman's interpretation on this resolution. I will admit that it is the same as 2 years ago. Two years ago the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency and the chairman of the subcommittee worked it out, and I feel sure it will be worked out this time.

I think it should be left up to us to work it out rather than the interpretation of the distinguished gentleman from Ohio, because the language itself is rather specific. I agree with his interpretation that this committee can do it, or the subcommittee can do it, but in reference to the vouchers, of course, that is the responsibility in this case of two, the whole committee and the subcommittee. I assume it will be satisfactory to the gentleman that whatever we do in working it out will be satisfactory to him.

Mr. HAYS. I may say to the gentleman that is exactly what I tried to say to the House. I said that the Committee on House Administration felt that we could not arbitrate the differences or possible disagreements within your committee, and we hoped your committee would work it out.

Mr. PATMAN. That is right.

Mr. HAYS. Just one word of admonition to the gentleman, however; that is, if you do not work it out you will have a rocky road to travel when you come back for more money.

Mr. PATMAN. I agree with the gentleman, we should work it out, and we will work it out. I realize we would have a very difficult time if we failed to work it out when we came back and asked for more funds. This is the biggest program of the present administration. It involves more than \$6 billion, and we will come back asking for more funds.

Mr. HAYS. I am not asking the gentleman to come back for more funds until the next session of the Congress.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. In view of the substantial amounts of money, not only in this bill but in other requests, and in view of the substantial amount of money that is going to be appropriated in this and other funds to the Committee on Banking and Currency, I am sure the Members of the House will expect some real development from this committee during the present year. I am going to be interested in the results of a very substantial amount of money being spent.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON THE ORGANIZATION OF THE CONGRESS

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Concurrent Resolution 4, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the House concurrent resolution as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That there is hereby established a Joint Committee on the Organization of the Congress (hereinafter referred to as the committee) to be composed of six Members of the Senate (not more than three of whom shall be members of the majority party) to be appointed by the President of the Senate, and six Members of the House of Representatives (not more than three of whom shall be members of the majority party) to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives. The committee shall select a chairman and a vice chairman from among its members. No recommendation shall be made by the committee except upon a majority vote of the members representing each House, taken separately.

SEC. 2. The committee shall make a full and complete study of the organization and operation of the Congress of the United States and shall recommend improvements in such organization and operation with a view toward strengthening the Congress, simplifying its operations, improving its relationship with other branches of the United States Government, and enabling it better to meet its responsibilities under the Constitution. This study shall include, but shall not be limited to, the organization and operation of each House of the Congress; the relationship between the two Houses; the relationships between the Congress and other branches of the Government; the employment and remuneration of officers and employees of the respective Houses and officers and employees of the committees and Members of Congress; and the structure of, and the relationships between, the various standing, special, and select committees of the Congress: *Provided*, That nothing in this concurrent resolution shall be construed to authorize the committee to make any recommendations with respect to the rules, parliamentary procedure, practices, and/or precedents of either House, or the consideration of any matter on the floor of either House: *Provided further*, That the language employed herein shall not prohibit the committee from studying and recommending the consolidations and reorganization of committees.

SEC. 3. (a) The committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act at such places and times during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Eighty-ninth Congress, to require by subpoena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, to procure such printing and binding, and to make such expenditures, as it deems advisable.

(b) The committee is empowered to appoint and fix the compensation of such experts, consultants, technicians, and clerical and stenographic assistants as it deems necessary and advisable.

(c) The expenses of the committee, which shall not exceed \$150,000 through January 31, 1966, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers signed by the chairman.

Mr. SKUBITZ. Mr. Speaker, this week the U.S. Department of Agriculture reported that the Commodity Credit Corporation had acquired \$1.369 billion worth of farm commodities from July 1, 1964, through January 1965. During this same 7-month period, CCC disposed of inventories valued at \$1.247 billion.

This tremendous turnover of Government-owned farm surpluses is costly, wasteful, and destructive of free market prices received by farmers for the products they sell in direct competition with CCC offerings. Currently we have substantial surpluses of wheat, corn, and a variety of agricultural commodities. Whenever CCC sells a bushel of grain, it displaces a bushel which would otherwise be marketed by a producer. The result is that for each of these bushels which CCC moves out of inventory through the front door, it acquires through the back door an equivalent amount under the loan storage program.

The in and out charges, the acquisition costs, the transportation expenses involved here are enormous. Moreover, the dumping of CCC-owned commodities depresses the free market prices upon which farmers depend for their principal source of income. The Government loses, the farmer loses. I have today introduced legislation which would prohibit CCC after July 1, 1965, from "making any sales—except sales offset by equivalent purchases—of wheat, corn, oats, rye, barley, grain sorghums, soybeans, or flaxseed at less than 125 percent of the current support price for any such commodity, plus reasonable carrying charges."

During 1965 at the peak of the wheat marketing season, CCC sold millions of bushels of wheat in direct competition with producer marketings, thus penalizing the farmer who signed up for the program as well as the ones who did not. Since October 1, the beginning of the corn marketing year, CCC has sold about 200 million bushels of corn in competition with farmer marketings.

The restrictions on CCC sales which I am proposing would not only result in substantial savings to the Government, but it would also increase the free market prices for corn, wheat, grain, sorghums and other commodities by at least 10 to 20 cents per bushel.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 32]

Ashbrook	Farnum	McEwen
Ashley	Friedel	Martin, Mass.
Blatnik	Gialmo	Martin, Nebr.
Brademas	Gibbons	Morrison
Collier	Hagan, Ga.	Morton
Conable	Hanna	Multer
Corman	Hansen, Idaho	Nix
Dawson	Harvey, Ind.	Powell
Diggs	Holland	Roberts
Edwards, Calif.	Irwin	Roosevelt

Roybal	Teague, Tex.	Watkins
Scott	Thompson, La.	Widnall
Secrest	Toll	Wright
Sickles	Utt	Wylder

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall, 389 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

NEW HOUSE GYMNASIUM

(Mr. HARRIS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to remind all Members of the House that this afternoon we will officially open and have ready for use the new House gymnasium. You received a notice from the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CEDERBERG] and me as members of the gym committee about 2 weeks ago.

The gymnasium will be opened at 4:30 p.m. and at 5 o'clock sharp there will be a brief ceremony at which time we will give special recognition to our beloved and esteemed colleague, the gentleman from Texas, ALBERT THOMAS, who has been chairman of the gym committee now for many years—almost 20 years I suppose.

For those Members who perhaps do not know where the gymnasium is located, if you will go to the subbasement in the Rayburn Building and enter from the Independence Street side, where the four elevators are, it is on the east end of that corridor; or, if you wish to go from the Longworth Building, if you go down the escalator you will be on the subbasement floor and can go around the corridor to the south side of that first corridor, where you will find the entrance to the new gymnasium.

The entire facilities of the old gymnasium are being transferred to the new one. This is for all Members of the House.

The program at 5 o'clock will be brief, and I know all Members will want to take a good look at this new facility for the health and welfare of the Members of the House. Everyone is urged to use these facilities. The use will be good for all of us.

We invite you to come. We hope you will be there for this occasion. I know you want to join us in paying special recognition to our colleague the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS].

TO AUTHORIZE PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF HOUSE DOCUMENT NO. 103, 86TH CONGRESS

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up House Concurrent Resolution 7 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. CON. RES. 7

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring). That there shall be printed an additional thirteen thousand five hundred and fifty copies of House Document Numbered 103 of the Eighty-sixth Congress in the style and format directed by the Joint

Committee on Printing; two thousand five hundred and seventy-five of such copies shall be for the use of the Senate and ten thousand nine hundred and seventy-five of such copies shall be for the use of the House of Representatives.

With the following committee amendment:

Following line 7, insert line 8: "Sec. 2. Copies of such document shall be prorated to Members of the Senate and House of Representatives for a period of sixty days, after which the unused balance shall revert to the respective Senate and House Document Rooms."

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HAYS] is recognized.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. There is nothing in the concurrent resolution to indicate the nature of the document. Would the gentleman state the nature of the material to be printed?

Mr. HAYS. It is a flat, semihard sheet of paper, about the size of the tablet I am holding, containing a code of ethics for Government employees, drawn up some years ago, which was printed once and for which there seems to be some demand for reprinting. It is used for hanging in Government buildings where Government employees work.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PRINTING OF THE PROCEEDINGS IN CONNECTION WITH THE ACCEPTANCE OF THE STATUE OF THE LATE SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, SAM RAYBURN OF TEXAS

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up House Concurrent Resolution 83 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. CON. RES. 83

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring). That the proceedings at the presentation, dedication, and acceptance of the statue of Sam Rayburn, presented by the Texas State Society in the Rayburn Building, together with appropriate illustrations and other pertinent matter, shall be printed as a House document. The copy for such House document shall be prepared under the supervision of the Joint Committee on Printing.

SEC. 2. There shall be printed five thousand additional copies of such House document, which shall be bound in such style as the Joint Committee on Printing shall direct, and of which one hundred copies shall be for the use of the Senate and five hundred copies shall be for the use of the House of Representatives, and four thousand four hundred copies shall be for the use of the Members of the Senate and the Members of the House of Representatives from the State of Texas.

March 11, 1965

With the following committee amendment:

On page 1, strike out lines 9 through 12.
On page 2, strike out lines 1 through 5, and add the following:

"Sec. 2. There shall be printed ten thousand additional copies of such House document, which shall be bound in such style as the Joint Committee on Printing shall direct, of which one thousand copies shall be for the use of the Senate and nine thousand copies shall be for the use of the House of Representatives, to be prorated for a period of sixty days, after which the unused balance shall revert to the respective Senate and House Document Rooms."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TO AUTHORIZE THE PRINTING AS A HOUSE DOCUMENT THE PAMPHLET ENTITLED "OUR AMERICAN GOVERNMENT. WHAT IS IT? HOW DOES IT FUNCTION?"

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, by the direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up House Concurrent Resolution 97 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. CON. RES. 97

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring). That (a) with the permission of the copyright owner of the book "Our American Government—1001 Questions on How It Works," with answers by Wright Patman, published by Scholastic Magazines, Incorporated, there shall be printed as a House document the pamphlet entitled "Our American Government. What Is It? How Does It Function?"; and that there shall be printed one million eighty-four thousand additional copies of such document, of which two hundred and six thousand copies shall be for the use of the Senate, and eight hundred and seventy-eight thousand copies shall be for the use of the House of Representatives.

With the following committee amendment:

Following line 12, add the following:

"Sec. 2. Copies of such document shall be prorated to Members of the Senate and House of Representatives for a period of sixty days, after which the unused balance shall revert to the respective Senate and House Document Rooms."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PRINTING OF INAUGURAL ADDRESSES FROM PRESIDENT WASHINGTON TO PRESIDENT JOHNSON

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up House Concurrent Resolution 125, with a committee amendment, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. CON. RES. 125

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring). That a collection of inaugural addresses, from President George Washington to President Lyndon B. Johnson, compiled from research volumes and State papers by the Legislative Reference Service, Library of Congress, be printed with illustrations as a House document; and that sixteen thousand one hundred and twenty-five additional copies be printed, of which ten thousand nine hundred and seventy-five copies shall be for the use of the House of Representatives, and five thousand one hundred and fifty copies for the use of the Senate.

With the following committee amendment:

Following line 11, insert the following:

"Sec. 2. Copies of such document shall be prorated to Members of the Senate and House of Representatives for a period of sixty days, after which the unused balance shall revert to the respective Senate and House Document Rooms".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PRINTING OF TRIBUTES BY MEMBERS OF CONGRESS TO THE LATE SIR WINSTON CHURCHILL

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up House Concurrent Resolution 153 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. CON. RES. 153

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring). That there be printed with illustrations as a House document all remarks by Members of the Senate and House of Representatives in the Halls of Congress which constitute tributes to the life, character, and public service of the late Sir Winston Churchill. The copy for such House document shall be prepared under the supervision of the Joint Committee on Printing.

SEC. 2. In addition to the usual number, there shall be printed five thousand eight hundred and sixty additional copies of such House document, of which one thousand and five hundred copies shall be for the use of the Senate, and four thousand three hundred and sixty copies shall be for the use of the House of Representatives.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REPRINTING OF HOUSE DOCUMENT NO. 103, 88TH CONGRESS

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up House Concurrent Resolution 165, with committee amendments, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. CON. RES. 165

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring). That the brochure entitled "How Our Laws Are Made", by Doctor Charles J. Zinn, law revision counsel of the House of Representatives Committee on the Judiciary, as set out in House Document

Numbered 103 of the Eighty-eighth Congress, be printed as a House document, with emendations by the author and with a foreword by Honorable Edwin E. Willis; and that there be printed one hundred thirty-two thousand additional copies to be prorated to the Members of the House of Representatives for a period of ninety days after which the unused balance shall revert to the Committee on the Judiciary.

With the following committee amendments:

On line 11, strike out "ninety" and insert "sixty"

On line 12, strike out "Committee on the Judiciary" and insert "House Document Room".

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PRINTING OF STUDY OF COMPENSATION AND ASSISTANCE FOR PERSONS AFFECTED BY REAL PROPERTY ACQUISITION IN FEDERAL PROGRAMS

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up House Concurrent Resolution 167 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. CON. RES. 167

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring). That there be printed for the use of the Committee on Public Works, House of Representatives, one thousand additional copies of a study made by that committee of compensation and assistance for persons affected by real property acquisition in Federal and federally assisted programs.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PUBLICATION OF DEPARTMENT OF STATE WHITE PAPER RELATING TO NORTH VIETNAM

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up House Concurrent Resolution 338, with a committee amendment, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. CON. RES. 338

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring). That (a) there be printed as a House document the Department of State white paper, issued February 17, 1965, relating to North Vietnam's campaign to conquer South Vietnam (Department of State Publication 7839). The copy for such House document shall be prepared under the supervision of the Joint Committee on Printing.

(b) In addition to the usual number, there shall be printed sixty-three thousand six hundred additional copies of such House document of which twenty thousand shall be for the use of the Senate, and forty-three thousand six hundred for the use of the House of Representatives.

With the following committee amendment:

Following line 12, insert:

"Sec. 2. Copies of such document shall be prorated to Members of the Senate and House of Representatives for a period of sixty days, after which the unused balance shall revert to the respective Senate and House Document Rooms".

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman if it is the common precept and tradition that we print these in the Congress rather than have the Department downtown print such a document and distribute it? I have no objection to this, but I am just seeking information.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, may I say that the Department printed a number of these and made them available to the Members of the House; but the demand has gone beyond that. This has been done in the past and I may point out that this does not necessarily represent the views of the House of Representatives, but is a Department of State compilation.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the statement of the gentleman and thank him.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the author of this resolution, the gentleman from New York [Mr. TENZER], I ask unanimous consent that he may extend his remarks following the passage of the concurrent resolution just agreed to.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. TENZER. Mr. Speaker, I want to compliment the gentleman from Ohio, Mr. WAYNE L. HAYS, the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Printing of the Committee on House Administration, for the expeditious manner in which his committee dealt with House Concurrent Resolution 338. Chairman HAYS and the distinguished gentleman from Texas, Mr. OMAR BURLISON, chairman of the Committee on House Administration, together with the members of the full committee and the Subcommittee on Printing have shown not only a recognition of the bipartisan aspects of our Vietnam commitment, but also a desire to insure the continuation of such bipartisan support by making certain that the American people are kept aware of the underlying reasons and the facts which justify this country's commitment.

The white paper does not offer a solution to the Vietnam conflict, but it does set forth in clear and concise form the case against Communist aggression in South Vietnam. This document provides the facts so that American citizens may judge the reasons for our role there and the future course of our defense of freedom in that area of the globe.

My colleagues in giving unanimous approval of the resolution have likewise acted expeditiously in this matter of great importance to our democratic form

of government and the American people will be fully apprised of all the facts.

PRINTING THE PRAYERS OF THE HOUSE CHAPLAIN

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration I call up House Resolution 230 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 230

Resolved, That the prayers offered by the Chaplain, the Reverend Bernard Braskamp, doctor of divinity, at the opening of the daily sessions of the House of Representatives of the United States during the Eighty-seventh and Eighty-eighth Congresses, be printed as a House document, and that two thousand additional copies be printed and bound for the use of the House of Representatives, to be distributed by the Chaplain of the House of Representatives.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 1, line 6, strike out "two" and insert "one"

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The resolution was agreed to.
A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PRAYERS OFFERED BY CHAPLAIN OF U.S. SENATE

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up Senate Concurrent Resolution 9 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

S. CON. RES. 9

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed thirty-two thousand two hundred and fifty additional copies of Senate Document Numbered 86, Eighty-first Congress, first session, being the prayers offered by the Chaplain, the Reverend Peter Marshall, doctor of divinity, at the opening of the daily sessions of the Senate of the United States during the Eightieth and Eighty-first Congresses, 1947-1949; of which ten thousand three hundred copies shall be for the use of the Senate and twenty-one thousand nine hundred and fifty copies shall be for the use of the House of Representatives.

The resolution was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

STUDIES AND INVESTIGATIONS BY COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up House Resolution 152, with committee amendments, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That, effective January 4, 1965, the expenses of the studies and investigations to be conducted pursuant to H. Res. 151 by the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed \$75,000, including expenditures for the employment of investigators, attorneys, and experts, and clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, and all expenses necessary for travel and subsistence incurred by members and employees while

engaged in the activities of the committee or any subcommittee thereof, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized and signed by the chairman of such committee and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

SEC. 2. The chairman, with the consent of the head of the department or agency concerned, is authorized and empowered to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any other departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The official committee reporters may be used at all hearings held in the District of Columbia, if not otherwise officially engaged.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 5, strike out "\$75,000" and insert "\$50,000".

Page 2, following line 10, insert line 11, "Sec. 4. No part of the funds authorized by this resolution shall be available for expenditure in connection with the study or investigation of any subject which is being investigated for the same purpose by any other committee of the House, and the chairman of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries shall furnish the Committee on House Administration information with respect to any study or investigation intended to be financed from such funds."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The resolution was agreed to.
A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES TO EMPLOY THREE ADDITIONAL EMPLOYEES

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration I call up House Resolution 248 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That, effective March 1, 1965, the Committee on Armed Services is authorized, until otherwise provided by law, to employ three additional employees, one professional and two clerical, at rates of compensation to be fixed by the chairman in accordance with section 202 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946.

The resolution was agreed to.
A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING THE EXPENDITURE OF MONEYS TO COVER EXPENSES OF THE COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY INCURRED PURSUANT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 133

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration I call up House Resolution 247, with sundry committee amendments, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That effective from January 3, 1965, the expenses of conducting the studies, investigations, and inquiries authorized by H. Res. 133, Eighty-ninth Congress, incurred by the Committee on Banking and Currency acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed \$200,000 \$150,000, including expenditures for employment, travel, and subsistence of attorneys, accountants, experts, investigators, and clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, with respect to any matter or matters in the field of housing coming

March 11, 1965

within the jurisdiction of such committee or subcommittee, including, but not limited to, (1) the status and adequacy of mortgage credit in the United States, (2) the terms and availability of conventional mortgage financing, (3) the flow of savings in relation to home financing needs, (4) the operation of the various Government-assisted housing programs, (5) the current rate of construction of residential dwelling units in relation to housing requirements and demands, (6) the role of housing construction in the national economy, (7) the requirement of and demand for Federal assistance in the development of community facilities, including mass transportation and other related facilities, (8) urban and suburban problems, including transportation facilities, as they affect the availability of adequate housing, (9) the operation of the slum clearance and urban renewal programs, and (10) rural housing and the adequacy of rural housing credit, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by such committee or subcommittee signed by the chairman of such committee or subcommittee and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

Sec. 2. No part of the funds authorized by this resolution shall be available for expenditure in connection with the study or investigation of any subject which is being investigated for the same purpose by any other committee of the House, and the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency shall furnish the Committee on House Administration information with respect to any study or investigation intended to be financed from such funds.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 4, after the word "Currency" insert "acting as a whole or by subcommittee".

Page 1, line 5, strike out "\$200,000" and insert "\$150,000".

Page 1, line 9, following the word "Committee" insert "or subcommittee".

Page 2, line 14, following the word "committee" insert "or subcommittee".

Page 2, line 15, following the word "committee" insert "or subcommittee".

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana, a member of the committee.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Could the gentleman from Ohio clarify for the Members of the House who under the amended language of this resolution is entitled or authorized to sign the necessary vouchers?

Mr. HAYS. May I say to the gentleman from Louisiana that this is exactly the same resolution, insofar as the committee or subcommittee language is concerned, that the House reported 2 years ago.

The Committee on House Administration, I believe it is fair to say, did not feel that we could arbitrate within the Committee on Banking and Currency. They worked this matter out themselves 2 years ago.

The Committee on House Administration does feel that the Housing Subcommittee is a very important subcommittee and that it should be separately financed and that the money should be used for that purpose.

I would interpret the language to read that if the work is done by the full committee then, of course, the chairman of the full committee would have the re-

sponsibility of signing the vouchers, and if it is done by the subcommittee, then according to the language as I see it, either the chairman or the subcommittee chairman could sign the vouchers, subject to approval of the Committee on House Administration.

Mr. WAGGONNER. I thank the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. PATMAN. I differ with the gentleman's interpretation on this resolution. I will admit that it is the same as 2 years ago. Two years ago the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency and the chairman of the subcommittee worked it out, and I feel sure it will be worked out this time.

I think it should be left up to us to work it out rather than the interpretation of the distinguished gentleman from Ohio, because the language itself is rather specific. I agree with his interpretation that this committee can do it, or the subcommittee can do it, but in reference to the vouchers, of course, that is the responsibility in this case of two, the whole committee and the subcommittee. I assume it will be satisfactory to the gentleman that whatever we do in working it out will be satisfactory to him.

Mr. HAYS. I may say to the gentleman that is exactly what I tried to say to the House. I said that the Committee on House Administration felt that we could not arbitrate the differences or possible disagreements within your committee, and we hoped your committee would work it out.

Mr. PATMAN. That is right.

Mr. HAYS. Just one word of admonition to the gentleman, however; that is, if you do not work it out you will have a rocky road to travel when you come back for more money.

Mr. PATMAN. I agree with the gentleman, we should work it out, and we will work it out. I realize we would have a very difficult time if we failed to work it out when we came back and asked for more funds. This is the biggest program of the present administration. It involves more than \$6 billion, and we will come back asking for more funds.

Mr. HAYS. I am not asking the gentleman to come back for more funds until the next session of the Congress.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. In view of the substantial amounts of money, not only in this bill but in other requests, and in view of the substantial amount of money that is going to be appropriated in this and other funds to the Committee on Banking and Currency, I am sure the Members of the House will expect some real development from this committee during the present year. I am going to be interested in the results of a very substantial amount of money being spent.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON THE ORGANIZATION OF THE CONGRESS

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Concurrent Resolution 4, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the House concurrent resolution as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That there is hereby established a Joint Committee on the Organization of the Congress (hereinafter referred to as the committee) to be composed of six Members of the Senate (not more than three of whom shall be members of the majority party) to be appointed by the President of the Senate, and six Members of the House of Representatives (not more than three of whom shall be members of the majority party) to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives. The committee shall select a chairman and a vice chairman from among its members. No recommendation shall be made by the committee except upon a majority vote of the members representing each House, taken separately.

Sec. 2. The committee shall make a full and complete study of the organization and operation of the Congress of the United States and shall recommend improvements in such organization and operation with a view toward strengthening the Congress, simplifying its operations, improving its relationship with other branches of the United States Government, and enabling it better to meet its responsibilities under the Constitution. This study shall include, but shall not be limited to, the organization and operation of each House of the Congress; the relationship between the two Houses; the relationships between the Congress and other branches of the Government; the employment and remuneration of officers and employees of the respective Houses and officers and employees of the committees and Members of Congress; and the structure of, and the relationships between, the various standing, special, and select committees of the Congress: *Provided*, That nothing in this concurrent resolution shall be construed to authorize the committee to make any recommendations with respect to the rules, parliamentary procedure, practices, and/or precedents of either House, or the consideration of any matter on the floor of either House: *Provided further*, That the language employed herein shall not prohibit the committee from studying and recommending the consolidations and reorganization of committees.

Sec. 3. (a) The committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act at such places and times during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Eighty-ninth Congress, to require by subpoena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, to procure such printing and binding, and to make such expenditures, as it deems advisable.

(b) The committee is empowered to appoint and fix the compensation of such experts, consultants, technicians, and clerical and stenographic assistants as it deems necessary and advisable.

(c) The expenses of the committee, which shall not exceed \$150,000 through January 31, 1966, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers signed by the chairman.

March 11, 1965

Approved For Release 2003/10/10 : CIA-RDP67B00446R000300160024-6

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

4669

RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, it is time to clip the wings of the Commodity Credit Corporation before it flies away with more of needed national farm income. That is why I am joining other of my colleagues in introducing a bill to strengthen the market price of wheat, corn, oats, rye, barley, grain sorghums, soybeans, and flaxseed by prohibiting the CCC from making domestic sales of such commodities at prices less than 125 percent of current support prices plus reasonable carrying charges.

This action is desperately needed if we are to avoid a repetition of past unwise manipulations by the CCC. All too often we have seen this Government agency throw its stocks on the market at uncalled-for low prices, sometimes right in the middle of the harvest season. The resulting sag in the market price to farmers has been catastrophic.

Mr. Speaker, I urge prompt consideration and passage of the bill. Prohibiting the Commodity Credit Corporation from selling its commodities at prices less than 125 percent of current support prices will at least maintain some semblance of order and keep the market at a point that approaches a fair level. It is time that the CCC became an instrument of Government that helps the farmer rather than hurts him.

TO ESTABLISH A JOINT COMMITTEE
ON THE ORGANIZATION OF THE
CONGRESS

(Mr. SKUBITZ asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. SKUBITZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise to commend my colleague from Indiana [Mr. MADDEN] on his excellent presentation today of the objectives and provisions of House Concurrent Resolution 4, to establish a Joint Committee on the Organization of the Congress.

The need for a full and complete study of the organization and operation of the Congress is long overdue.

In this age of instant communication, computer statistics, and the growing complexities stemming from the economic mobility of our population, Federal dominion over many aspects of the daily lives of our citizens is a clear and present reality.

Whether the flow of authority to Washington results from an inexorable tendency on the part of the Federal bureaucracy to expand itself in keeping with Parkinson's laws, or rather results from a receding ability or willingness on the part of State and local governments to keep up with the needs of our citizens, it is not my purpose here to debate.

I simply state as a fact that the Federal Government is more and more involved with the affairs of every citizen, as evidenced by the growing army of Federal workers in the executive branch and in the sheer amount of legislation we, the people's representatives, are called upon to dispose of in this Congress.

Mr. Speaker, we tolerate the inefficiencies in our democratic system of Government as a very small price to pay for the blessings of liberty. Certainly, no one of us wants to trade what we have, for all its faults, for the odious imposition of a totalitarian dictatorship or for the chaos which is the companion of anarchy.

Still, acceptance of the weaknesses inherent in any democracy gives us no license to divest ourselves of the responsibility to improve the mechanics of the system to keep pace with the ever-changing times.

In the last session of Congress, I introduced a measure designed to eliminate a part of the legislative procedure that has been obsolete for many years. I said at that time:

The growth of Government has made it mandatory for the legislative branch to modernize its procedures. If the Congress is to meet its responsibilities as regards efficiency and economy, a close relationship between the House and Senate tax raising and tax spending committees must be established.

I repeat that statement today, as it is as valid now as it was then, and I have reintroduced my bill to create a Joint Committee on the Budget with the hope that it will be passed in this session of Congress.

But there are additional operations of the Congress which deserve study with an eye toward modernization. It is my hope that a careful study by a Joint Committee on the Organization of the Congress would define and illuminate these additional operations, and with that goal in mind, I pledge to work for passage of House Concurrent Resolution 4.

Mr. Speaker, I urgently recommend passage of House Concurrent Resolution 4.

(Mr. SKUBITZ asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mr. SKUBITZ' remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

(Mr. GERALD R. FORD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I have requested this time to make inquiry of the distinguished majority leader of the program for the remainder of this week and next week.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I yield to the majority leader.

Mr. ALBERT. In response to the inquiry of the minority leader, there is no further business for the remainder of this week.

The program for next week is as follows:

Monday is Consent Calendar day.

There are four bills under suspensions, as follows:

H.R. 4152. Amending laws relative to Federal intermediate credit banks and

production credit associations to expedite return of Government capital and improve operations.

H.R. 5075. Increase Farmers Home Administration loan fund limitation.

H.R. 5874. School construction under Public Law 815 in Puerto Rico.

H.R. 4714. To amend the Cultural Development Act.

For Tuesday and the balance of the week:

Tuesday is Private Calendar day.

H.R. 5505. Federal standards for congressional redistricting, under a modified closed rule, with 3 hours of general debate.

H.R. 4185. Patent Office fees, under an open rule with 2 hours of debate.

H.R. 5374. Relating to salaries of Supreme Court Justices, under an open rule with 1 hour of debate.

H.R. 4527. Authorization of funds for the U.S. Coast Guard.

This, of course, is made subject to the usual reservation that conference reports may be brought up at any time and that any further program may be announced later.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY,
MARCH 15, 1965

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact we have completed the legislative program for this week, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, do I understand that there will be no pro forma session tomorrow?

Mr. ALBERT. The gentleman is correct. There will be no session at all if this permission is granted.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. Boggs). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR
WEDNESDAY BUSINESS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule may be dispensed with on Wednesday next, March 17, 1965.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

CORRECTION OF THE RECORD

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to correct the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 9, 1965. On page 4341, column 1, lines 12 and 13 of the fourth paragraph, please delete the words "of 1 percent."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

March 11, 1965

4670

FORMULATION OF THE FOREIGN POLICY OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. DORN] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the subject of Vietnam.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

(Mr. DORN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to support the position of the President of the United States and the Department of State. I believe the vast majority of the Members of this House and the other body, and the overwhelming majority of the American people are supporting the position of the President on Vietnam. The President's decision to send additional combat units into South Vietnam, namely, additional Marines, is a wise decision. I feel that this is the greatest single issue before the American people and before the free world today. It is the question of whether or not we are going to back up before Communist aggression in this great key area of the world in southeast Asia which is confronting us today.

Mr. Speaker, the President of the United States, our Commander in Chief today, is eminently qualified to make decisions concerning South Vietnam and concerning Berlin, the Congo, and the other areas of the world where the Communists are exerting pressure. The President of the United States today has more experience in this field than any President ever to occupy the White House in the history of our country. For more than two decades the President has been sitting in on every major foreign policy decision and every military decision that this country has made. As majority leader of the other body, as Vice President of the United States and now as President and Commander in Chief. I want to repeat that he has been in on every major foreign policy decision made during the last 20 years.

Our distinguished and able Secretary of State, Dean Rusk, knows Asia. He served as a lieutenant colonel in this very area of the world in which we are concerned today as an aide, as one of the top aides, to "Vinegar Joe" Stillwell in the China-Burma-India-Southeast Asia theater. He was assistant Secretary of State for Far Eastern Affairs under President Harry Truman.

The first team, Mr. Speaker, is in charge of the foreign policy of our country today. They are specifically behind our refusal to withdraw from South Vietnam and our refusal to negotiate when negotiations have already been held, agreements made and signed.

Are we going to pull out of South Vietnam? Mr. Speaker, it is unthinkable to me, incredible and unbelievable, that any thinking American would demand that in the face of the enemy we turn tail and run. This is particularly so at this

time when Kosygin, who is Premier of Russia, is trying to feel out the world situation.

We are going to give him any encouragement to continue or to start new aggression in other areas of the world? What did he say in Hanoi recently? And I might say while some possibly well-meaning but certainly unthinking Americans were demanding that we withdraw from South Vietnam, demanding that we negotiate, Kosygin was saying the same thing; he was demanding that we withdraw not only from South Vietnam but also from South Korea and all of Asia. And these screaming, howling voices in America, demanding that we withdraw, were only echoing the voices of Kosygin, Ho Chi Minh, Mao Tse-tung, and Communist leaders throughout the world.

I believe, for one, that the President should be supported, not these international gangsters, these proponents and architects of infiltration, terrorism, and subversion who are exerting every effort to conquer the entire world.

Right after the white paper which is a true documentation of facts as to aggression in South Vietnam, was issued by the State Department, what was the story heard over Moscow Radio, Peiping Radio, Hanoi Radio at that very moment or a few days after that white paper was issued? Of course, they have been demanding that we withdraw. They have referred to the white paper as a pack of lies. They have attacked constantly the President of the United States and the Secretary of State.

Let us look at what Moscow Radio said about the President a few days ago. They said that he was the leader of a bandit gang of imperialists. What did Peiping Radio say about Adlai Stevenson, our Ambassador to the United Nations? They said that he was comparable to Dr. Goebbels, Adolph Hitler's propaganda minister, and called him a Goebbels-type politician. They have attacked the Secretary of State.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say that it is shocking to see Americans echoing this same sentiment. Yes, it has come over the radio from Cuba. They have called Members of this Congress by name, since they rose on the floor of this Congress; Tass, the other day, the mouthpiece for Moscow, ridiculed any number of Members of this House who rose in support of the President of the United States solely because they refused to back a policy advocated by some to withdraw from South Vietnam, and to negotiate. Negotiate under what conditions? Oh, my friends, these are serious times. This is a great crisis. But I want to say this, that both Houses of the Congress should have a say in foreign affairs and the White House today welcomes opinions expressed on the floor of this House. It is our problem and that of the American people, just as it is that of our Commander in Chief.

Mr. Speaker, what is the question in southeast Asia? Are we going to pull out of this key area of the world? There are those who say that this is a faraway place, that it is a dirty war, that there are swamps, and the communications are

not good, and it is the wrong place to fight and therefore we ought to pull out.

Mr. WAGGONER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DORN. I am delighted to yield to my distinguished friend from Louisiana.

Mr. WAGGONER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DORN. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. WAGGONER. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I want to compliment him on the position he has taken in this matter.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that we Members here in the Congress have to stand firmly behind the decision which the President of the United States has made with respect to Vietnam.

This is a situation which the President has inherited and is one of long standing. It is one to which every thinking American realizes there is no easy answer.

The decisions which the President has made with respect to Vietnam must be supported by every loyal American and must be supported here in the Congress. We have drawn a line and if we yield here, where do we stand? We cannot stand in Berlin nor can we stand anywhere else in the world, nor can we realistically draw another line against Communist aggression.

Mr. Speaker, on several occasions I have said during these last few weeks that I support the President in this, and it is distressing to me to find Americans belittling the position which the President of the United States has taken.

Just today I heard over the radio that the World Council of Churches had condemned the position of the United States in Vietnam. It is inconceivable to me that so-called men of God would side with godless communism and against the President in a grave matter such as this.

For years now, many Americans have complained about our failure to take a firm stand against Communist aggression.

We have now that exact opportunity.

We have taken a stand.

Our stand is just and right.

We must not yield.

Mr. Speaker, I have said it before and I say it again, I stand with the President of the United States. He has drawn a line and I stand on that line with him. No Member of this Congress can do less.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DORN. I yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I desire to compliment the gentleman on the statement he is making. I am sure his expression of strong support for the President of the United States in handling the South Vietnam difficulties has the overwhelming support of this House and of the country.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that the gentleman is making this statement today.

Mr. DORN. I thank the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

March 11, 1965

Mr. DORN. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Speaker, I too want to join with my colleagues in thanking the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. DORN] for giving many of us here this afternoon the opportunity of saying that like him we do support the policy of our great President in this troublesome situation that we are facing in South Vietnam.

Mr. Speaker, I have talked with the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina many times about the Communist menace. I know there is no one in this House who is a more dedicated American. There is no one who is more determined to back the President of the United States, when he tells the world that we ought not to negotiate from weakness, but that we are determined to negotiate from strength.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure that the gentleman could agree with me when I say that the President of the United States is the one leader that we have who knows all of the facts, who has the information that will enable him to make these critical day-by-day decisions. I am sure the gentleman from South Carolina would agree with me further when I say that I think we, as Members of Congress, owe the President our support. We owe him our loyalty, as exemplified now by the gentleman from South Carolina, in this troublesome situation in Asia. He is letting the world know that we in America believe in living up to our commitments and we do not intend to retreat in the face of communism anywhere in the world.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. DORN. I thank the gentleman from Florida for his contribution to this discussion. I am grateful for his kind remarks. There are those who are telling us that this is a nasty war in South Vietnam, that the monsoons come, it is muddy, there are a lot of quagmires and jungles; therefore they want to pull out.

I want to ask my colleagues: Where would they make a stand for freedom? Do they want to fall back to Hawaii. Is the territory or the terrain any better in Alaska?

I might remind the House that the Communists in Russia still claim Alaska as Russian territory. They do not recognize the treaty of 1867, when we paid \$7½ million for Alaska. Is the terrain in the western part of the United States any better? Is it too cold in the Rockies? Are they going to fall back because the weather is bad?

The Communists chose South Vietnam precisely because it is an isolated area and a difficult place for us. For these reasons they are hoping we will give up; that we will abandon the struggle and withdraw. Or maybe we will start the slow surrender procedure by negotiation.

I say that we have every right to be in southeast Asia. We spent billions of dollars in Korea, and in southeast Asia we spent billions of dollars during World War II, and hundreds of thousands of lives. We have every right to be there for the cause of freedom. Our President

is only echoing a strong stand taken by three Presidents not to be shoved, not to be pushed, out of southeast Asia by these diabolical manipulators of world domination.

Mr. Speaker, Commodore Perry in 1856—more than 100 years ago—speaking before the National Geographic Society in New York, said that some day the autocracy and the totalitarianism of central Asia and freedom, as exemplified by the Western World, would meet in a death struggle in southeast Asia. Theodore Roosevelt, that great President of the United States, warned this country about a combined united Eurasia with the goal of world domination. Genghis Khan in the 12th century consolidated Asia and then conquered all of eastern Europe including the Balkans. The only thing that saved western Europe and Western civilization was the fact that Genghis Khan died and his son pulled his forces back into eastern Europe.

There are those who make light of the rising power of Red China. It is variously estimated today that Red China has a standing army of from 2.5 million to 10 million professional soldiers. It is estimated they have a militia of 100 million. They have atomic bombs, and it is predicted that in the near future they will explode a hydrogen bomb. Around 45 years ago Lenin said, "the road to Paris is the road through Peiping." They already have Peiping. They have consolidated their position in Red China. They are ready to proceed on that road to Paris. The next stop en route is South Vietnam.

I see my distinguished friend from Indiana. I want to say that the steering committee of this House adopted unanimously a resolution supporting the President, and the men on that side of the aisle and in the other body representing the great Republican Party have supported the President in his Vietnam policy.

It was surprising to me, since the President ordered additional marines to South Vietnam, to note some rumbling of discontent in the capitals of Western Europe, particularly around Paris. This fight in southeast Asia today is for the independence of Western Europe, it is for the independence and freedom of our own country, and for freedom-loving peoples all over the world.

Yes, they are on the road to Paris.

The population of Red China today is estimated at 700 million. They are moving through North Vietnam toward the rubber, tin, and oil of the Near East.

Not far from Singapore, the crossroads of the world, you will find Indonesia, with over 100 million people and vast resources. Then just to the west of Red China we find India, a nation of almost 400 million people, already under attack 2 years ago. With additional millions of Red troops, it is reliably reported that Red China is in a position to attack India again when the time is ripe.

I might remind the House, Mr. Speaker, that in the Near East you will find 67 percent of the world's untapped oil, and in the Himalayas a great percentage of the world's uranium. This is a fight today to control the natural resources of

the world, not only the sealanes in south China, the Bay of Bengal, the straits, and the Indian Ocean, but to unite the Asian landmass. Then where will Western Europe be? With 67 percent of the world's oil and a great portion of the world's uranium, north Africa would outflank Western Europe, and, as Lenin predicted, Western Europe would fall without the firing of a shot. It would fall like a ripe apple into the arms of the aggressor.

With Eurasia and with Afro-Eurasia, with its contiguous landmass, where would America be situated? With Africa only 1,500 miles from Brazil, we would be in an impossible position economically and militarily. Again I want to ask, Where are these unthinking Americans willing to make their stand for freedom?

Mr. CABELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DORN. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. CABELL. At this point, Mr. Speaker, our distinguished colleague, who is not only distinguished in his own right but bears a very distinguished name, raises the point of anyone daring on the floor of this House to espouse the cause of communism. You will remember that a few days ago one of our esteemed colleagues in a very thoughtless moment suggested this question for debate on the floor of this House. A debate calls for two sides of a question or for a divergence of opinion. There can be no divergence of opinion on this matter, because we have only the American and the Communist side, and the Communist side is not debatable on the floor of this House.

Mr. DORN. I thank my friend from Texas.

This is a time for unity.

I want to repeat we are actually in a death struggle. We are in a war at this very moment in South Vietnam, in one of the most strategic and one of the most important areas of the whole world and our President and Commander in Chief needs the united backing of the American people to win this war to preserve democracy and freedom. This is an action, I might say to my great majority leader and to our distinguished Speaker, for peace—to preserve peace. If we withdraw, then that is the road to war—that is the road to a possible nuclear holocaust. It is the road that will engulf the entire world in war. This has been the history of modern civilization.

But if we want peace and if we believe in the preservation of peace, we will stand firm in South Vietnam.

Mr. FOUNTAIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DORN. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. FOUNTAIN. I want to commend the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina for the wonderful statement he is making in connection with the position that our President has taken in southeast Asia, and particularly with respect to the contest, the very deadly contest now taking place in Vietnam.

I would like to ask the gentleman his opinion as to just what would happen in southeast Asia if we were to pull out of South Vietnam?

Mr. DORN. It would have a tremendously adverse psychological effect on the entire world. Half of the world's population would say, "Well, the United States is no longer interested in small nations." They would say that we are no longer interested in freedom. In my opinion, it would be the green light for the Communists to move into some other area and for a large portion of the world to become neutralists, if not actually running up the hammer and sickle.

Mr. FOUNTAIN. I agree with the distinguished gentleman. The door of opportunity for the Communists would be opened to a number of countries in southeast Asia and in my opinion in a very short time the Communists would take many of them over. I think it is time for us to recognize more clearly the fact, as the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. DORN] has pointed out, that we are engaged in a deadly, devastating contest over the integrity of the individual versus the integrity of the state, testing whether the philosophy of Jesus Christ and other similar greats or the philosophy of Karl Marx, Lenin, Stalin, Khrushchev, and Kossygin, and others like them shall prevail. That serious and dangerous contest is going on in many parts of the world, but in a most devastating manner. It is being waged in South Vietnam between the forces of freedom and the forces of slavery.

I had the pleasure of listening to the Secretary of Defense, Mr. McNamara this morning in the Committee on Foreign Affairs. Of course, I cannot repeat what I heard there. But as one who has heard report after report last year and this year as to what is taking place, what the possibilities are, what we are doing and what we may have to do, and what we are determined to do I am satisfied that the President of the United States has taken the only course he could take. And as the gentleman from South Carolina has already pointed out, this House sometime back passed a resolution supporting the President and saying in effect to all the world, especially the Communist, that we would stand behind him and support him in whatever steps he found to be necessary in the defense of freedom in South Vietnam and southeast Asia and throughout the world. As for me and my household, as was the case with this great body we stand firmly in just that manner behind the President of the United States. There is no other course at this time.

There is nothing as yet to negotiate. Let me add here the only kind of negotiation that I would every agree, would be a negotiation resulting in the complete withdrawal from South Vietnam of the North Vietnamese and a stop to the war of aggression they are waging against the freedom loving people of South Vietnam.

Again I want to commend the gentleman for his statement and thank him for giving me this opportunity to join him in supporting our President on this very important question.

Mr. DORN. I want to thank my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from North Carolina. We can have peace and we can have negotiation, as the gentle-

man so ably states, if the North Vietnamese and the Red Chinese and the Russians would stay out of this area of the world and go back to their own countries and let the people of South Vietnam live in peace and develop economically in peace as was intended by the Geneva Agreements of 1954 and in the agreement concerning Laos in 1962. We would go home. We would be delighted to go home. We would be more than glad to pull our troops out of South Vietnam if these people—the aggressors—would return to their own homelands.

Mr. CHELF. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DORN. I yield to the gentleman. Mr. CHELF. Mr. Speaker, I, too, would like to join with my colleague, the most able and learned representative from the great State of South Carolina, in what he has had to say today not only about the Congress but the American people defending the position of the President of the United States in Vietnam. My colleague is exactly right when he says that if we pull out of South Vietnam now, we will live to regret the day. Once we begin to back away we literally fall into the trap of the Communists. That is exactly what they want us to do—to become discouraged, disgruntled, disgusted if you please—yes; tired of the whole thing. When this happens—just where do we draw the line as you have so ably mentioned here today.

I always carry with me, lest I forget, a statement made by Lenin many years ago. I carry it around with me constantly in my wallet. I look at it every now and then. I am going to read it now so that all of you who have read it before will be again reminded of its contents. For the purpose of the Record, I want you to hear it again, and again. Do not ever forget that this is a blueprint of the whole Russian philosophy just as "Mein Kampf" was the map and the chart of Hitler.

Here are Lenin's own words:

"We are living not merely in a state, but in a system of states; and it is inconceivable that the Soviet republic should continue for a long period side by side with imperialist states. Ultimately, one or the other must conquer."

He says:

Ultimately one or the other must conquer.

And here is the pitch:

Meanwhile, a number of terrible clashes between the Soviet republic and bourgeois states is inevitable.

South Vietnam is no exception. This is the pattern. My friend from South Carolina is correct. I applaud him. I commend him and everybody on the Republican side both in the House and the Senate for their stand. Thank God for men like you, our Democratic and Republican leadership who are upholding our President's hand in this time of peril.

Mr. DORN. I thank my friend the gentleman from Kentucky.

It might be well for us to remind ourselves of this. I am glad the gentleman keeps that quotation with him. We all need to be reminded of the diabolical, sinister design of the Communist conspiracy upon the entire world. We need to bear that constantly in mind.

It might be well for us to remember the Communist dogma. They say man is only as gravel or stone or wood or any other chemical substance, to be used for the conquest of the world and the infiltration and domination of the world—that and nothing more. They do not recognize the dignity and worth of man, as is true in our democratic Christian concept.

We might keep that in mind. They are bent upon and sworn to the conquest and domination of the entire world. When dealing with them, sitting down to negotiate with them, we ought to keep that constantly in mind.

One of the distinguished Members of the other body—I believe it was the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia—said that the Communists will steal your cow and a calf, will keep the cow and negotiate about the calf. I know some Members came from the farm, as I did. Soon the Communists will get the whole herd that way. That is exactly the method they follow—two steps forward, one step back; steal your cows, keep part of them and negotiate about the others.

We should keep that in mind.

Mr. FOUNTAIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DORN. I yield to my friend from North Carolina.

Mr. FOUNTAIN. Earlier in his remarks, the distinguished and able gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. DORN] commended those upon whom we must rely for the facts, for truth, and for decisions, secretary of State Rusk, Mr. McNamara, and many others. I join the gentleman in the commendation he has paid them for their firmness in this hour.

I should like to add, on the basis of the facts which have come to me as a member of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, even if we should be requested to do what someone has suggested, may happen (something which I am sure will not happen), if we should be requested by the South Vietnamese Government, whichever one it might be at the time, to get out of Vietnam—on the basis of the facts as I know them, today, in my opinion (whether we got out or not), if the North Vietnamese should not withdraw their own long ago agreed upon line, we would have no alternative but to continue to resist their aggression. We would have to fight on. It is unthinkable that we would ever negotiate any kind of truce or agreement except the kind that would bring the kind of peace and the kind of North Vietnam withdrawal about which the gentleman and others have spoken so clearly.

Mr. DORN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DORN. I yield to my friend the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. PATTEN. I thank the gentleman from South Carolina. I agree with the gentleman 100 percent. I always have. This goes back more than 40 years. I support my President and my Secretary of State.

In this case it is really a pleasure, because only last Thursday night we spent 2 hours at the White House. It was

March 11, 1965

wonderful to be brought up to date and to get the briefing we received.

I fear, in our little talk here, that some people on the outside may get the wrong impression. I wonder, considering the military and economic facts about South Vietnam, about the alternatives. I would like to know what the Council of Churches said, as was mentioned on the floor.

I would like to know what the other members of the United Nations are saying about us and on what basis they say it. I want to tell you I would like to know more about the opinion existing in southeast Asia. I have gotten a little shaken up by that recent Indian election. If anyone were to tell me that in the southern part of India 40-some Peiping Communists could get elected when 29 of them are in jail, I would not believe it. It just makes you think a little bit.

Now, if I am going to fight a fellow, I like to fight him on my terms and not on his. If world communism is the threat today, then, maybe from a military point of view we should have a little revision in our policy and activity. Sometimes I think that in the position we are in today they could send down 100,000 men from China and not miss them and then send another million next week and next week send another million and still not miss them. So I say whether we are in the right place at the right time, taking into consideration all the economic factors and the political factors and what the rest of the world is doing, is something we should consider. I think we ought to tell people that our minds are open and this Congress wants to get all of the information it can get. However, I do not wish to detract one bit from the fine job you are doing on the floor here today and I want to associate myself with your remarks.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the distinguished gentleman for raising some very pertinent questions concerning this entire crisis and this controversy.

In regard to negotiations, I would like to say to those who are advocating that we negotiate, that in South Korea, in Greece, in the Philippines, and in Malaya where we and where our allies came in contact with the Communists in open combat, we won. We have never won, to my knowledge, in negotiations. Therefore, these people who are proposing that we negotiate today, I think, are really proposing that we negotiate another surrender, another withdrawal, another loss. I do know that wherever we have stood firm in the right, with principle on our side, that the Communists have backed down. When we stood for the right with sufficient military hardware behind us, we won.

Let us look for just a moment at some of the negotiations which we have had in the recent past with the dictators. It has been mentioned here on the floor time and again, but I do not think we can mention it too often. I believe one of the saddest sights I have ever seen was that of Neville Chamberlain returning to London, England, in the rain with his high top hat and his umbrella, waving before the people of London and the good people of England a scrap of paper.

What did this paper have on it? It had Hitler's name signed to it. Then he smiled and said, "This means peace in our time." This was after socializing with, breaking bread with, and negotiating with some of the most infamous international gangsters of our time. I think Neville Chamberlain, Lord Halifax, Daladier, and Bonnet, who went to that conference, are equally guilty today with Adolph Hitler for commencing World War II. They are virtually as guilty for causing the expenditure of billions of dollars, for the destruction of the many billions of dollars of property and for the more than 25 million lives lost during World War II. Why do I say that? Because they wanted to negotiate away the freedom of Czechoslovakia—the freedom of a free people. That contributed not to "peace in our time," but to war, chaos, and the very trouble we are having around the world today.

I remember some other conferences, too, conferences which were entered into in good faith by the leaders of our country. How can we forget Teheran, Yalta, Potsdam, when we were led to believe that all of the countries of eastern Europe, including Latvia, Estonia, and Lithuania, would be given the right of self-determination by the people and the right to vote when the war was over. Russia never kept a single one of those agreements. We negotiated with them. We sat across the table from them. Yes, we did that at Potsdam. But we have lost, may I say again, every time we sat at a table with them. Every time we conducted negotiations with them we lost.

What about Korea? I remember being in Korea in 1951. The one great Chinese army had been committed in North Korea and had been destroyed largely by the armed forces of the United States. So the Communists sought a negotiation; they sought a truce, and through great pressure from some of our friends we sat down with these people, in Kaesong, I believe it was, and later at Panmunjom for 2 whole years.

I could repeat it for you in private, but I could not on the floor of this House, what the Communist negotiators called the representatives of the United States, generals representing our armed forces, men in uniform—they called them unprintable names. They kept their hats on during the conferences and would then walk out and say, "We'll see you next week," or "next month."

This went on for 2 years. Red China trained, I am reliably informed, five whole new armies.

Yes, they will negotiate when they are out of ammunition. They will negotiate when they have to. They will negotiate when they are licked. I think that if we stand firm in South Vietnam we are sure to win, if we remain united.

What about the agreements in Geneva which created a North Vietnam and a South Vietnam? This was through negotiation. This was through agreement. We have not broken any agreement. We have not broken our unilateral commitment. But, Mr. Speaker, the solution to this problem is very easy if the Communists will go beyond the 17th parallel, if

they will go back to their own country and if Kossygin will quit demanding that we pull out of all of the free countries of Asia. That is the solution of the problem.

Mr. Speaker, there is one other thing that I might remind my colleagues of and that is that this war in South Vietnam today is aggression. It is war, but not in the formal sense as we have known it. We need to understand this. A lot of people will say, "Well, it is a civil war and we should not get mixed up in a civil war."

This is not a civil war at all. This is war; stark, open aggression in a different form—terrorism, subversion, trained infiltrators, trained saboteurs sent in under the table, so to speak, in an effort to terrorize the population.

The Communists have learned a lesson from open aggression. Their tactics now call for aggression through infiltration, subversion, sabotage, and terrorism. They send "volunteers" and secret agents into a nation to be victimized. Riots, demonstrations, and the overthrow of the Government become the method of conquest. This new technique of aggression is more effective and dangerous than open aggression and promises more success. This new technique calls for negotiating whenever a respite is needed or when there is a need to strengthen the home base. In open conflict with the Communists, such as in Korea and Greece and even in Malaya and the Philippines, the forces of freedom were victorious. On the other hand, through negotiations the free world has not chalked up a single victory.

The hospitals particularly have been attacked, and schoolteachers are their favorite targets. Civilians have been massacred and left on the highways, for an obvious reason, to stampede and terrorize the people of South Vietnam, and also some in the United States who will want to negotiate and pull out.

Again I want to ask, Are our people willing to make a stand? Mr. Speaker, I honestly believe that destiny and history are calling upon us today to stand firm.

I do not know what the future holds. I think we should persevere, be patient. But I shudder to think what will happen if we do not persevere, if we withdraw, if we pull out and leave this road to Paris wide open, leave the road open to this uranium, tin and rubber as well as 1500 million people. What will be the effect on the economy of the world? What will be the effect on military strategy?

Mr. Speaker, this is an hour when the people of this Nation and all of the free world need to stand up and be counted against the ruthless, diabolical international dictators who would conquer southeast Asia as a step toward the conquest and enslavement of the entire world.

The entire world is watching our action in South Vietnam. The freedom loving world is hoping and praying that the United States will not fail. They are hoping we will stand firm and resist once and for all Communist aggression in Vietnam, in Berlin, and wherever it rears its sinister head. This could well

March 11, 1965

be our greatest opportunity to win a major victory over the forces of communism in a strategic world area.

The South Vietnamese have earned the admiration of the entire free world for waging a gallant struggle under adverse circumstances. In this valiant struggle they deserve the support of all of the free world. It is gratifying to note that South Korea and the Philippine Republic are coming to the aid of South Vietnam. The Communists can be defeated and driven forever out of southeast Asia with a united effort. We must encourage every member of SEATO and every nation whose freedom is threatened in southeast Asia to send aid to South Vietnam.

I do not know—no one knows—what will happen if we persevere in our policy in South Vietnam. But I know what will happen if we do not persevere. I am unqualifiedly with the President.

Mr. MOELLER. Mr. Speaker, I strongly endorse and support the administration's policy of strength in Vietnam—not because it is the best policy of my party but because it is so clearly in the best interests of my country.

Let there be no misunderstanding or confusion as to why we are in Vietnam: We are there for the simple reason that the Communist strategy of conquest is "Vietnam today—tomorrow southeast Asia and the world."

History tells a grim story of the chaos that almost always follows when freemen become too timid and too apathetic to resist aggression. World War II, with its millions of dead, might well have been averted had the great powers faced up to Hitler in the late 1930's instead of deluding themselves that the Nazi appetite for blood would be appeased by "just one more" victim.

I say that we either continue to draw the line in Vietnam or we invite world war III by encouraging the Communists to stake out a progression of "final" victims until, finally, the United States itself becomes the direct target.

So the withdrawal of U.S. assistance to South Vietnam would not lessen the risk of a general nuclear war—it would serve instead to heighten that grave possibility to the point of making it inevitable.

This is the message that we deliver today to those Americans who contend that we have no business in Vietnam, that we are fighting the wrong war in the wrong place at the wrong time. I would remind the advocates of a negotiated settlement that freedom is not a negotiable issue, that there is no "wrong" time to make a stand for freedom and there is no "wrong" place to resist raw and naked aggression.

Surely, we have learned the bitter lesson by now that the Communists, lacking honor, will honor no treaty that cannot be twisted and corrupted to further their own evil designs.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that the general impression in the United States is that the Communist Vietcong is receiving practically no opposition from South Vietnamese troops, that they lack the will to fight. This is not true.

If the war is going badly for the South Vietnamese, it is going far worse for the Communists. In the last 3 years, more than 60,000 Communist invaders have been killed in action compared to less than 18,000 loyalist troops. More than 1 million natives of North Vietnam have fled from their homes—and communism—for sanctuary in the South.

This is hardly the record of a people who allegedly do not care whether their country is taken over by the forces of communism.

There is no easy and painless solution to the war in Vietnam. But, then, the price of freedom is always high. It is a price that Americans have willingly paid since the founding days of this Republic. They will do no less today.

Again, I support the administration's policy on Vietnam because it is right.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, I want to express my great admiration for the excellent presentation of the agonizing problem of Vietnam and I want to express my warm regards for the gentleman from South Carolina. His presentation was an action that has seldom been equalled in this House.

By expressing his knowledgeable support of our President he has performed an outstanding patriotic service.

I join with him in his expression of support and confidence in President Johnson.

I recently visited Vietnam and I would like to state that we have our first team on the scene superbly led by Ambassador Taylor, Ambassador Johnson, and General Westmoreland.

Our military and civilian personnel are of the highest competence. They are doing an excellent job. Perhaps, too, this is a time to make an observation about the Vietnamese soldiers. They are fighting and fighting well and they are being killed and wounded and they are doing this to repel the aggression taking place in their country. The fatality rate is a staggering one. So let no one cast doubts as to the willingness of the Vietnamese to fight.

The coup-coup approach to government among the generals beclouds the true fighting qualities of the Vietnamese soldier. If a stable government can be established in Saigon I have no doubt that the war can be successfully concluded in South Vietnam. If the political officers and monks in Saigon would give patriotism the same priority that soldiers of Vietnam give then we would see the sun break through the dark clouds.

I think too that we can take heart that our policy to make the war less appealing to the Communists by our air strikes is starting to show dividends as one reads the political omens emanating from the Communist capitals. I am sure that the Communists are pondering well whether the acceptance of damage in the north is worth satisfying their appetite for aggression in the south. I think too that President Johnson has made it clear that if they go back home their would be no need to negotiate for the war would be over.

They have merely to live up to the agreements they signed in 1954 and 1962.

Perhaps too it should be said that our President and our Nation is most fortunate in having as Secretary of State, Dean Rusk. I am confident that history will record him as one of our country's great Secretaries of State at a time when our country could afford no less.

And so I thank my colleague, Congressman DORN, for giving me this opportunity to speak. And I compliment him for the job he has done here today. It was a job well done.

OFFICE OF COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. O'HARA of Michigan). Under previous order of the House the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MORSE) is recognized for 30 minutes.

(Mr. MORSE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, during the 88th Congress, the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. ELLSWORTH), the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. MACGREGOR), the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. MATHIAS), the gentleman from Maine (Mr. TUPPER), and myself introduced legislation to create within the Executive Office of the President an Office of Community Development.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to take the floor this afternoon to inform the House that we have been joined by 18 other Members in filing similar legislation in this, the 89th Congress: the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ANDERSON), the gentleman from California (Mr. BELL), the gentleman from Utah (Mr. BURTON), the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. CLEVELAND), the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. CONTEL), the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN), the gentleman from New York (Mr. GOODELL), the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. GRIFFIN), the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HARVEY), the gentleman from New York (Mr. HORTON), the gentleman from California (Mr. MAILLIARD), the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. MCCLORY), the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. MOSHER), the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. QUIE), the gentleman from California (Mr. REINECKE), the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RUMSFELD), the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SCHWEIKER), the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. SHRIVER), and the gentleman from New York (Mr. SMITH) have filed legislation today.

Mr. Speaker, this, in my view, is a significant effort, because we believe that our Federal Establishment must give greater concern, greater attention to the problems of the metropolitan areas throughout the country.

We believe that our approach is the right way to do it.

Mr. Speaker, a principal element of the legislation filed by these 24 Republican Members, representing 13 of our States extending from Maine to California, would be the establishment of an Office of Community Development which would coordinate the many programs which have a major impact upon the Nation's metropolitan areas.

be more welcome. For 50 years we have been compelled to keep at least half an eye on the possibility of all-out war. The exasperations incident to efforts to find solutions for ever increasing problems have diverted energy which might better have been expended in more constructive ways. In spite of our amazing progress in general, sore spots in our great society demand long-deferred medication. There is too much crime and not enough education. Extremes of wealth and poverty produce complaisance on one side and resentment on the other. The reign of law and order has not been fully established in the land. All around the fringe of an industrious and capable and benevolent corporate entity exist small groups of extremists who preach violence and disorder. We need desperately a clear and unharassed head to contemplate the means by which we may make ours a truly ideal society.

In this year of 1965 the whole structure of American Government has originated a determined attack on our domestic problems. It may be that we can find strength to follow up that attack relentlessly and still keep our commitments to helpless people who are struggling to preserve their freedom in far corners of the earth. It may be that other stabilized nations will come to our aid and help make the whole task easier. Better still would it be if the only force that keeps the world in turmoil would cease and desist. So long as they continue in their course, their own fate must be imperiled and our own progress must be impeded. But whatever happens, communism must be opposed or no good thing can possibly result.

A UNIFORM PERIOD FOR DAYLIGHT SAVING TIME

(Mr. FRASER (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, today I have again introduced a bill to standardize daylight saving time.

This legislation is designed to provide a uniform period of daylight saving time and eliminate some of the confusion which results from variations in daylight saving time. My bill would simply have all daylight saving time begin at 2 a.m. on the last Sunday in April and continue until 2 a.m. on the last Sunday in October, of each year.

The bill would not force any State or community to go on daylight saving time, but would simply require that the cities and States which have elected to utilize daylight saving time would all shift on and off daylight saving time on the same day.

This bill is a straightforward measure designed to eliminate needless confusion and is identical to the one I introduced in the 88th Congress.

The need for standardization has become more important with each passing year. Many local authorities have found themselves faced with a dilemma in deciding on the effective dates for daylight saving time.

In my own State of Minnesota last year, Duluth was torn between starting daylight saving with the other Minnesota cities at the end of May, or earlier, when its twin city of Superior, Wis., changed its clocks. Again this year the Minnesota Legislature was unable to reach an agreement on a measure to decide the effective dates for daylight saving time.

According to a recent survey of the States observing daylight saving time on both a statewide and local option basis, all but five States switched to daylight saving time the last Sunday in April. For this reason, I have used this most common starting date in my bill even though most of my own State of Minnesota currently observes a later date.

The most frequently used date to return to standard time is also the date contained in this bill, the fourth Sunday in October—though a wide variety of dates exist.

There seems to be no good reason for all this variance. I am certain many States and communities choose their changeover dates without any real awareness of the confusion they are causing and the need for uniformity. We need to correct current practices and prevent further confusion in the future.

My bill would provide for a standard 6 months of daylight saving time for those States and communities which utilize daylight saving time. It would not impose any unwanted change to daylight saving time on those sections of our country which prefer standard time. It would only amend the existing Standard Time Act, enacted in 1918, to provide for a uniform period of daylight saving time.

Standardization of daylight saving time would result in cost savings to airlines, buslines, and railroads, as the need to change schedules would become less frequent. It would eliminate some annoying time confusion for the traveler whether he is going by automobile or public transportation. Broadcasting and communications in general would also benefit.

We cannot afford to waste the resources of our country, particularly when the cause of the waste can easily be corrected. For this reason, I have sponsored this legislation and urge my colleagues in the House to sponsor similar legislation to provide a uniform period for daylight saving time.

ELDERHOAX, OR THE MASTERS OF DECEPTION

(Mr. FULTON of Tennessee (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. FULTON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, for several weeks now the House Ways and Means Committee has been considering a number of proposals designed to meet the mounting and pressing health care needs of our senior citizens.

There are more than 100 such proposals now before the committee. But the two that have drawn the most public attention are H.R. 1, which is the administration's bill to provide for hospital

and nursing home care through social security, and the eldercare plan to permit States to improve their Kerr-Mills medical assistance programs for the indigent.

Both of these proposals have merit. In our consideration of them we are fortunate that we will not be asked to decide which is good and which is bad, but which is best.

There is, however, a campaign abroad today to totally discredit one of these programs while attempting to beguile the public, and especially our senior citizens, into believing the other is something that it is not.

I refer, of course, to the current multi-million-dollar propaganda campaign being conducted by the American Medical Association to hoodwink the American taxpayer into believing that eldercare is the product of divine revelation while the medical care program was devised by Satan himself.

This campaign is utilizing the slickest gimmicks in the Madison Avenue bag of tricks. The techniques employed are half-truth, concealed truth, sly inference, and outright deception. Put them all in a pot, stir them with mass exposure on radio, television, and paid printed advertising, season it with \$4 or \$5 million collected from the Nation's ill and infirm and you have a nice little entree to be served up to the American public as though it were the inspiration of a master chef.

I suggest that if we permit the American public to bite into this tasty looking tidbit, they will be left with a very bad taste in their mouths for a long time. It will not be the chef who is left with the blame, however, it will be the waiter who served it. In this case the waiter will be the Congress of the United States.

Eldercare is a better program, so the argument goes, because it is sponsored and endorsed by the American Medical Association. Their argument is that if anyone knows the health needs of our senior citizens and how they should be met, certainly it must be the Nation's doctors.

I submit that if this were the case, the Forand bill would have passed the Congress back in 1957. As a matter of fact, the American Medical Association has step-by-step used every method at its disposal to oppose any medical care program for the elderly.

AMA opposed the Forand bill. AMA opposed the Kerr-Mills program. And now AMA opposes the administration's program.

I must give them credit, though, never before in the AMA's history has that body even admitted the Nation's elderly have a health care problem. At least today it does recognize this fact as evidenced by its support of Eldercare. I suggest this is a great step forward for this wise organization. Today it sees what millions of Americans have seen and recognized for years.

Now it is said again by the AMA that medical care through social security is "socialism." But it does not suggest that this is true of Eldercare. I submit that Eldercare is far more socialistic than any program we are considering today.

March 11, 1965

It is 90 percent welfare-statism. It is a program paid for by the taxpayers with money taken from general funds and doled out entirely by Government agencies. It is welfare, pure and simple.

What about benefits? The AMA alleges that Eldercare would offer much more than medical care through social security. "Offer," that is the key to this half-truth. As a matter of fact there is not a member of the American Medical Association who can tell you what Eldercare would provide. They do not know because it is up to the States to decide just what will be provided and just how much money they will put into the program which will determine just how broad coverage will be and just what benefits will be offered.

What would the proposed medical care through social security guarantee? It guarantees to almost every living American over 65, when the program becomes operative, payment for up to 60 days of inpatient hospital service—including drugs—the first day to be paid by the recipient; 60 days in convalescent centers after discharge from hospital; 240 home visits a year by visiting nurses or similar personnel; hospital outpatient diagnostic services, minus a small deductible.

What does eldercare guarantee? It does not guarantee one single, solitary thing. Think about that for just a minute. Eldercare does not guarantee a thing. Nowhere in the eldercare proposal will you find a guarantee of hospital care, nursing home care, or the highly touted payment of physician and surgical fees as the American Medical Association would have the American public believe.

The AMA is cautious to say that a wide range of services could be "offered." But it is just as cautious to neglect to tell the American public that these benefits would be offered only at the pleasure of each participating State. Just what services would be offered and the extent of coverage would be determined by each State wishing to participate. There is not even a guarantee in the eldercare proposal that any State would establish such a program.

We have had the Kerr-Mills program for almost 5 years. There are still 10 States which have no Kerr-Mills program. The fact is that the richest States get the lion's share of the Federal funds available for Kerr-Mills. The fact is that the poorer States cannot afford to put up enough State funds to provide a meaningful program. The fact is there is no reason to believe that on a State-by-State basis, the medical care provided by eldercare would be significantly better than it is under the impotent Kerr-Mills program.

Now let us talk about cost. The American Medical Association would have the American public believe that medical care through social security will destroy the social security system and cost the American taxpayers untold billions of dollars. How much would eldercare cost? Well, the AMA does not rightly know but you can be assured, its spokesmen say, the cost would be mighty small by comparison. Now, I submit this is

just another half-truth out of that Madison Avenue bag of tricks.

How can the eldercare program provide all the benefits AMA wants the American public believe it will provide and yet cost so little? Just how much the AMA does not know. The answer is that it cannot. Every country boy knows that you just plain do not get something for nothing. Even an out and out welfare program has to be paid for by the taxpayers. It is obvious that if eldercare will do all the American Medical Association wants the American public to believe it will do, then it is going to cost the taxpayers more than a little cash. If it is not going to cost the taxpayers, then it is not going to provide the services the American Medical Association would lead us to believe.

Ask any doctor, any member of the American Medical Association, or any person who has any knowledge of eldercare what it will cost? They will not be able to give you an honest estimated guess. They just do not know because the program offers everything but guarantees nothing. The States will determine, by the amount of their individual participation, how many State tax dollars will be put into the program and how many Federal tax dollars will be needed. Should the program be fully implemented, and there is no reason today to believe by any stretch of the imagination that it ever would be, it is estimated the program will cost the American taxpayer about \$4 billion a year or twice the social security medical care program.

Just how much would the social security medical care program cost the American public? The medical care program is to be financed through an increase in social security tax collections and tax base. The tax base will be raised from \$4,800 to \$5,600 a year. The added tax for health care will not exceed forty-five one-hundredths of 1 percent of income at any time and it will not even reach that figure until 1969.

If we break this down we can see that medical care through social security is going to cost those paying social security taxes the "outlandish and unbearable" sum of 48 cents a week. Those who do not earn \$5,600 a year will, of course, pay less.

As for destroying the social security system, the American Medical Association fails to divulge that the health care taxes will go into a separate trust funds and will have no effect on the social security retirement system or its ability to provide benefits.

And another thing, the American Medical Association states that it just is not fair for a man who is earning \$50,000 a year to receive the same benefits and pay no more than the man earning \$5,600 a year.

This is illogical on two counts. The same people earning \$50,000 a year can today earn maximum social security benefits without contributing a cent more than the man who earns \$5,600. I have not heard the American Medical Association criticize this aspect of social security. As a matter of fact, there is legislation in the committee now which

would make doctors eligible for coverage under social security.

In addition, medical care through social security is not a welfare program which is doled out to the destitute. It is an insurance program. From salary \$5,600 a year on up to \$56 million you get benefits in return for your premium payment. This is how all insurance works. It does not matter how much a man earns. He gets a amount of benefits for a number of dollars. In other words, it costs the man making \$5,600 a year just as much for a \$50,000 life insurance policy as it does the man who earns \$100,000 a year.

And then there is all this Government control of medicine that the American Medical Association warns of. Again, the AMA fails to point out two very significant facts. One is that the social security medical care plan in no way deals with physician services, fees, or care. It has nothing to do with the actual practice of medicine. The other is that the AMA has not read, or chooses to ignore, title XVIII, hospital insurance benefits for the aged of H.R. 1. For the AMA's benefit and the benefit of the American public, I will quote that section as follows:

PROHIBITION AGAINST ANY FEDERAL INTERFERENCE

SEC. 1801. Nothing in this title shall be construed to authorize any Federal officer or employee to exercise any supervision or control over the practice of medicine or the manner in which medical services are provided, or over the selection, tenure, or compensation of any officer or employee of any hospital, extended care facility, or home health agency; or to exercise any supervision or control over the administration of any such hospital, facility, or agency.

If that does not spell it out in words the AMA can comprehend then it cannot be done.

The eldercare bill is a worthy proposal. It contains some excellent features which I would like to see included in any health care program we pass this year. But the American Medical Association has done the eldercare proposal a great disservice by trying to convince the American public that it is something it is not.

I am not willing to pay the price of the cruel hoax the American Medical Association is trying to perpetuate on the American people. If the Congress should pass the eldercare program there will be a severe price to pay when this hoax is laid bare. And that price will not be paid by the American Medical Association. It will be paid by the Members of Congress.

(Mr. MOELLER (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MOELLER'S remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

LEGISLATION INTRODUCED TO BAN U.S. SHIPMENTS ABOARD ALLIED SHIPS GOING TO NORTH VIETNAM

(Mr. ROGERS of Florida (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) was granted per-

mission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced legislation to ban U.S. shipments aboard allied ships going to North Vietnam. The bill would prohibit cargoes to or from U.S. ports being transported aboard any vessel flying any foreign flag used in sea trade with Communist North Vietnam.

Right now one such ship is in New York Harbor at the Claremont Terminal. The vessel flies the Panamanian flag, and is called the *Severn River*. Last year the *Severn River* went to Communist North Vietnam, and visited the U.S. ports of Richmond and Norfolk afterward. The ship put into New York last Thursday, March 4, from Communist Poland, and is loading scrap metal to be hauled to Italy.

My bill is not aimed primarily at the *Severn River*. It is aimed at the more than 200 allied-flag ships which have hauled Communist cargoes into North Vietnam since June of last year at a time when the United States is sending more and more military men and equipment to southeast Asia to combat Red aggression.

It makes no sense to provide those allies hungry for "30 pieces of silver" with U.S. dollars gained from carrying American cargoes if they are going to supplement the Communist burden of keeping the Vietcong supplied. This situation is particularly offensive in view of the latest Maritime Administration figures showing that the American merchant marine is now carrying less than 10 percent of U.S. ocean trade.

Congress should enact this bill as soon as possible. The *Severn River* and ships like her have no business in America's ports.

EVENTS IN SELMA, ALA.

(Mr. DULSKI (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, all right-thinking Americans are concerned by recent events in Selma, Ala.

One of the basic principles on which our country was founded is the right of all of its citizens to vote and participate in their government. America itself stands for law and order.

All of our expressions of sympathy and denunciation of the deplorable situation in Selma will not solve the problem. Action is needed, and needed now, to put legislation on the books which will grant every qualified American in every State the right to vote without threat of harm or intimidation.

What has happened in Selma, Ala., has no place in our American way of life, and it is certainly not the America we are proud of.

We pour millions and millions of dollars into programs designed to create a favorable image of the United States among nations abroad, and one incident such as this does irreparable damage to our prestige and to our democratic way of life. Recently, an article in a lead-

ing Swiss newspaper came to my attention and I wish to include a translation of it, which was written in French, at this point in the Record:

Photo caption: "We have seen this elsewhere—during Hitler's reign. To punish them under the threat of clubs, the sheriff of Selma makes Negro children run for miles. If they fell from exhaustion, they would be given the electric cane treatment."

SELMA.—The sheriff of Selma, James Clark, and some policemen, armed with clubs and electric canes used for prodding cattle made 170 Negro high school students run for several miles in the country to punish them for having organized a quiet march on the courthouse.

The children, exhausted after having run almost 4 miles (policemen followed them in cars) finally succeeded in escaping in a garden by the side of the road. The policemen could not find them.

RUN

"You wanted to march, well go ahead, run now," the policemen yelled at them. The youngsters, aged 9 to 17, were terrorized. Several of them, quickly winded, collapsed on the road. A young girl, found alongside the road by some newsmen, was weeping. She held her hand to her head where she had a knot. She told newsmen that a policeman had hit her, with an electric cattle cane because she did not want to run.

VOTING RIGHTS LEGISLATION

(Mr. PEPPER (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, most of us, I am sure, have been shocked and shamed by the spectacle of the Governor of Alabama this last weekend ordering State troopers and others acting under the authority of the State to attack and brutally assault with clubs, trample upon with horses, and subject to tear gas, citizens of the State of Alabama and of the United States doing nothing more than making a brief appeal for their right to vote. He has now given grist to the propaganda mill of the Communists all over the world to assert that citizens of this country do not have the protection of our Constitution and that freedom for all the people of this country is not a reality.

We can at least let the world know that the Government of the United States denounces such tyrannical tactics and will take some steps, at least, toward the prevention of their repetition.

The heart of America has been stirred by this tragic and horrible episode. The conscience of America, as well as our Constitution, demands that the Federal Government take effective action to see to it that there is truth in that part of the Pledge of Allegiance to our flag when we say "One nation, under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all."

Let us speed the enactment of legislation which will assure equal voting rights for all of our population without discrimination on account of race, creed, color, or national origin, and without the disfranchised having to give or risk their lives to enjoy this precious heritage which should belong inviolate to every American.

YESHIVA UNIVERSITY 20TH ANNIVERSARY

(Mr. TENZER (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. TENZER. Mr. Speaker, it was my honor and privilege to attend the convocation at which three honorary degrees were conferred by Dr. Samuel Belkin, president of Yeshiva University, on the occasion of the university's 20th anniversary.

The honorary degree of doctor of humane letters was conferred upon Dr. Donald Frederick Hornig and upon Mr. Samuel Hyman Golding.

The degree of doctor of laws was conferred upon the Honorable HUBERT HORATIO HUMPHREY, JR., Vice President of the United States.

Yeshiva founded 79 years ago in New York City as an advanced school for the training of rabbis, became a university in 1945. Its record of growth and achievement in 20 years is a tribute to its distinguished president, its officers, members of the board of trustees and board of overseers.

The outline of that period of growth follows:

	1945	1965
Students.....	850	6,000
Faculty.....	94	1,200
Teaching centers.....	1	4
Undergraduate schools.....	2	4
Graduate and professional schools.....	2	9
Annual operating budget.....	\$440,000	\$29,500,000

The chronological growth follows:

In 1945, Yeshiva became the first university under Jewish auspices in the United States.

In 1954, Stern College for Women was established.

In 1955, Albert Einstein College of Medicine was established.

In 1957, graduate school of education was established, Wurzweller School of Social Work was established, and Sue Golding Graduate Division of Medical Sciences was established.

In 1958, Belfer Graduate School of Science was established.

In 1961, 10-year \$65 million blueprint for sixties development program announced at a convocation at which U.S. Chief Justice Earl Warren received an honorary degree.

In 1962, Sol and Hilda Furst Hall, main center was erected.

In 1964, new residence hall, main center, was erected; Ullman Research Center for Health Sciences, Bronx Center was established.

Outstanding amongst its schools is the Albert Einstein College of Medicine. The story of the medical school is one of vision, courage, and faith in our democratic way of life. The college was built through the generosity of men and women of all faiths throughout the country. It has advanced in a few years to the front ranks of American medical schools and is now embarked on a new program to meet the challenge of medical progress.

March 17, 1965

The next 10 years will be a decade of unprecedented scientific opportunity—not only in terms of the exploration of outer space but also in terms of inner space—the invisible world of cells, viruses, and genes which hold the key to life and health.

Dr. Joseph H. Lookstein, honorary trustee, when presenting Dr. Donald Frederick Hornig to the president of the university made the following statement:

Mr. President, the realm of the scientist has widened and his function greatly expanded. He has become the fearless explorer of "the heavens above, the earth below, and the waters beneath the earth." Indeed, the universe is now his laboratory, man his primary concern and the Great Society is the goal of his researches.

In our midst is a scientist who conforms to that image. He is the distinguished physical chemist and chief adviser on science and technology to the President of the United States—Dr. Donald Frederick Hornig.

His illustrious career began early and advanced rapidly. At 20 he received his degree in science from Harvard and 3 years later, his Ph.D. from the same university. At 24 he was a group leader at Los Alamos, playing an important role in the development of the first atomic bomb. Presently he joined the faculty of Brown University and soon became dean of its graduate school. Then he moved on to Princeton to serve as chairman of the department of physical chemistry there.

Those were happy academic years of inspired teaching and creative research. He published some 70 scientific papers on a range of subjects that are an index of the versatility of his mind and the comprehensiveness of his scholarship.

Yet he could never be classified as a cloistered scholar, preoccupied with mystic formulas and esoteric equations. It was natural for him to respond enthusiastically to the demands of national duty and to the call for public service. Three Presidents of our country in rapid succession availed themselves of his profound knowledge and his consummate skill as an administrator.

He took leave of Princeton to direct the Office of Science and Technology. In that office he is achieving distinction as a wise advisor to our President on scientific affairs. Simultaneously he has become a trusted counselor, helping to chart the course for the advancement and improvement of education in our land.

At Los Alamos amidst the blasts of nuclear fission he heard the music of romance. It was there that he met a research associate who became a loving life's companion and an accomplished colleague in his scientific labors. Their four children understand well the Biblical passage concerning a "help-mate suited unto him."

I have the honor, sir to present Donald Frederick Hornig for the degree of doctor of humane letters, honoris causa.

Dr. Samuel Belkin, president, Yeshiva University, read the following citation in conferring the honorary degree of doctor of humane letters upon Dr. Donald Frederick Hornig:

Your life has been rich in scientific achievement. You are internationally acclaimed as one of the most skilled investigators in your chosen field of physical chemistry. As the chairman of the President's science advisory committee you exercise with dignity and humility one of the greatest responsibilities ever entrusted to an academician.

In appreciation of your career which is rich in service to the scientific community and to the Nation in its totality, we deem it

a privilege to confer upon you the degree of doctor of humane letters, honoris causa.

In token thereof I cause to be placed over your shoulders, the visible symbol of our high regard for you, and I hand you this diploma.

Dr. Joseph H. Lookstein, honorary trustee, when presenting Samuel H. Golding to the president of the university, made the following statement:

Mr. President, when the Albert Einstein College of Medicine of Yeshiva University was virtually in its infancy, a timely and dramatic act of generosity helped to launch it upon its course of rapid growth and ultimate eminence.

The pioneering philanthropist who performed that act is the remarkable and extraordinary man of vision and of goodness—Samuel H. Golding whom we honor this day.

The life story of this man is one of the fascinating sagas of American opportunity. He came to these shores as a tender youth. Eager and dynamic, he proceeded at once to labor and to learn to study and to earn. To this day he delights to recall that his meager livelihood in those days was eked out by selling, of all things, fly paper, and shoe laces.

Like many a Jewish boy he studied to be a doctor but soon realized that his interest lay elsewhere. He turned to law and received his degree and became a member of the bar of the State of New York.

His active mind and infallible foresight soon veered him into new directions. He became one of the foremost builders and realtors of our metropolis.

He transformed swamplands in Long Island into gardens and residences and the barrenness of the Concourse and Fordham into thriving communities. Much of the skyline of Manhattan bears testimony to his skill and ingenuity.

In 1928, 1 year before the stock market crash, he embarked upon a new career. He founded a bank and before long developed it into one of the foremost financial institutions of its kind. The finest hour of this intrepid man came during the dark and troubled days of the great depression. The doors of his institution remained open throughout that crisis.

But character, and not substance, is the true measure of this man. His wealth is not in his vaults but in his heart. His roster of benevolences includes every great cause and every deserving institution of education and welfare.

The Sue Golding Graduate School and the chair in microbiology, both at the Albert Einstein College of Medicine, the Bar-Ilan University in Israel, Lebanon and Beth Israel Hospitals, Dartmouth College, the Cerebral Palsy Clinic and Hospital for Special Surgery are but a few of the institutions blessed by his kindness. Transcending even these are countless benefactions made to individuals and agencies without public knowledge and in the noblest tradition of charity under cover of anonymity.

Mr. President, this superb man, exemplary husband, loving father, and proud grandfather is prevented by illness from witnessing our collective admiration and our sincere tribute. The honor is being conferred on him through his revering and adoring son.

May I request you, sir, to confer upon Samuel H. Golding the degree of doctor of humane letters, honoris causa. May this honor serve as a token of our blessings to him for good health, long life, and continued service in the vineyard of society.

Dr. Samuel Belkin, president, Yeshiva University, read the following citation in conferring the honorary degree of doctor of humane letters upon Mr. Samuel Hyman Golding:

You are a living example of what practical wisdom and moral integrity can achieve in our beloved land of opportunity; your career as one of the leading financiers of our city is a happy combination of useful living, caring for the advancement of scientific knowledge, and a deep dedication to the alleviation of human suffering.

The Sue Golding Graduate Division of Medical Sciences of the Albert Einstein College of Medicine, of which you are the founder, stands as a great tribute to your vision and generosity.

It is therefore a pleasure to confer upon you the degree of doctor of humane letters, honoris causa.

In token thereof we transmit to your beloved son the visible symbol of our high regard for you, and through him, I hand you this diploma.

Dr. Joseph H. Lookstein then presented the Honorable HUBERT HORATIO HUMPHREY to the president of the university, stating:

Mr. President—

"I received my ideas from my church, from my community experience, from my family experience, and from my mother and father."

Religion, community, family, and parents are the precious ingredients that fashioned the illustrious personality who spoke these words. They came from the lips of the brilliant, buoyant and winsome Vice President of the United States, HUBERT HORATIO HUMPHREY.

He first saw light in a humble dwelling above his father's drugstore, in a small town in the dustbowl of South Dakota. Hardly an auspicious beginning. But then, the genesis of many of America's immortals is more frequently associated with a log cabin than with a stately mansion.

When the great depression came, he was only a sophomore at college. He returned home to help with the family budget. His academic education appeared ended.

But fate decreed otherwise. He married his beloved Muriel, sweetheart of his childhood. She urged him back to college. How did they manage? By serving as janitors, they got free rent in a house off the campus.

These melancholy facts of life need recalling. They enable us to understand the zeal of our Vice President in advocating a full education as the inalienable right of every American youth. They also demonstrate that neither hardship nor adversity can halt the advance of determined souls.

He graduated from the University of Minnesota magna cum laude, and 1 year later received his master's degree from the University of Louisiana. Presently he became a full professor of political science. But he was not to remain long at that calling.

His manifold endowments began to be recognized and to win him acclaim. It became especially apparent that people loved him even as he loved people. Twice he was chosen as mayor of Minneapolis and then an admiring State elected him to the Senate of the United States.

In that great forum his vibrant voice championed every righteous cause and assailed every foe of liberty and justice. A matchless eloquence served as a vehicle for a prophetic passion. The International Health Act; the Peace Corps; the National Defense Education Act, are but a few of the sparkling stars in the firmament of his magnificent career as statesman and legislator.

His choicest triumph was the enactment into law of the civil rights bill. His masterful generalship and superb strategy contributed to make that possible. To borrow his own metaphor, he helped to wash the face of America clean.

And now, a valiant defender and guardian of democracy is the second in command of our Nation's destiny. No President could

A substantial reduction in imports is needed to prevent increasing and unnecessary dependency on foreign oil. In addition, the resulting increase in domestic production would provide additional incentive to explore for and develop needed reserves.

I am particularly disturbed by the enormous growth in imports into district V in relation to crude oil production. I would hope that the Department of the Interior can take effective action to encourage the use in district V of the vast oil capability existing in the Rocky Mountain area, particularly my State of Wyoming. I would hope that it would be possible to reduce greatly district V imports which now are running at the rate of 58 percent of the crude oil production for that area.

The mandatory oil import program which was designed to implement this policy has been helpful in stemming the tide of foreign oil. Without this program and the fine manner in which you have administered this program, Mr. Secretary, I am confident that the domestic petroleum producing industry—especially the independents—would be in shambles today. This mandatory oil import program has served its purpose well. But, it is a long way from its goal as laid down by our President when it was established in 1959, as follows:

"The new program is designed to insure a stable, healthy industry in the United States, capable of exploring for and developing new hemispheric reserves to replace those now being depleted. The basis of the new program, like that of the voluntary program, is the certified requirements of our national security which make it necessary that we preserve to the greatest extent possible a vigorous, healthy petroleum industry in the United States of America."

In spite of the goal laid down in 1959, when the mandatory oil import program was established calling for reserves to replace those now being depleted, the domestic industry has suffered such a deterioration that, in 4 of the past 7 years, this Nation has had a deficit in crude oil reserves. By that, I mean, we have found and developed less crude oil than we have produced in 4 of the past 7 years. This is a serious situation and must be corrected. One of the most important ways to restore the incentives needed to search for new oil reserves is to make meaningful adjustments in the mandatory oil import program.

Mr. Secretary, we have a good broad based oil producing industry. It is worth preserving. As I mentioned earlier, there has been a great sellout and merger trend over the past few years in this industry. I am told that several billion dollars worth of oil properties have been purchased from the smaller oil companies by the giant oil companies in the past half dozen years. This is not a healthy development. This country needs the thousands of independent oilmen to scour this Nation in the search for oil. This Nation's greatest oilfields, such as East Texas, might still be unknown were it not for the independent oilmen.

Mr. Secretary, your own report recently released, states and I quote:

"The independent has traditionally been the front-runner for the industry's exploration activities. He does most of the wildcatting and, according to industry estimates, finds most of the oil, perhaps 80 to 85 percent."

This is good. Here is an industry that shows great competitive effort. An industry where men still are willing to risk all of their economic wealth in the search of this vital commodity—petroleum. We must maintain the independent if this industry is to meet the awesome future demands for crude oil and natural gas.

How do we do it? Simply by permitting the independent oil men to sell their products at a fair price and in quantities suffi-

cient to generate the funds needed to search for petroleum. Today he is not able to do that, principally because of excessive imports of cheap foreign oil.

Mr. Secretary, I have searched my mind on how best to restore some health to the independent. I am sure you have also been scratching your head on what to do.

I have talked with oil men back in Wyoming. I have talked with my fellow Members of Congress, and we all agree that a substantial reduction in oil imports will go a long way toward reversing the adverse trends in the domestic petroleum producing industry. I recognize that this may not be a simple thing to do in view of our many international commitments, but it is a must if this vital national security industry is to survive and prosper.

Finally, I wish to bring to your attention another situation which I consider uncalled for and one which needs to be rectified. Today, our military establishment purchases from foreign sources over 200,000 barrels daily of jet fuel and gasoline which is about 35 percent of its requirements. Of this total purchased abroad, 35,000 barrels daily are imported into the United States where these products are readily available at reasonable prices. These excessive purchases not only are harmful to the domestic petroleum industry, but they also are aggravating our very serious balance-of-payments deficit.

I believe that the military should:

1. Forego the importation of 35,000 barrels daily.

2. Purchase no more than 15 percent of its requirements from foreign sources, thereby resulting in increased domestic production and increased incentives to explore for and develop needed reserves.

I have studied the 11-point program submitted to you by the Independent Petroleum Association of America. To me it seems reasonable and valid. I recommend that you give it serious consideration in your efforts to meet this pressing oil import problem.

STATEMENT OF CLIFFORD P. HANSEN, GOVERNOR OF WYOMING, REGARDING THE MANDATORY OIL IMPORT CONTROL PROGRAM, MARCH 10-11, 1965

As Governor of the State of Wyoming, the fifth-largest oil-producing State in the United States, I should like to submit the following evidence to show that the mandatory oil import control program as now enforced has been detrimental to the interests of my State in particular, and to this country in general.

Wyoming, like many other States, is highly dependent economically upon the level of oil exploration and production. Table I, attached, shows the amount of money paid annually as property taxes on production within our State since 1959, and the percentage of this figure to all the property taxes collected. This table illustrates the significance of oil production to our State and county governments.

Table II shows that production within Wyoming has steadily declined since 1961. It is even more alarming that the proven reserves within our State (table III) have also declined during the same period. The reason for this decline in reserves is apparent from a study of table IV, which shows the number of exploratory wells drilled in Wyoming since 1959. Except for a very modest increase in 1964, this trend has been steadily downward for the past 5 years.

In the opinion of many experienced observers of the oil economy, the reason for the decline in domestic drilling must be tied directly to the oil import program. While allowable production from many domestic States is on the decline, the level of imports from foreign countries is constantly increasing.

The high level of cheap foreign imports has made a perpetual oversupply of crude oil

available that has put constant downward pressure on the price structure of domestic crude oil. This has strapped the domestic operator between rising prices of materials and labor and the declining price for his product. The recently released report of the Department of the Interior on the oil industry recognized that under these circumstances the position of the domestic operator is untenable.

I wish to make the following recommendations to the Department:

1. That the level of imports of crude oil and crude oil products (except residual oil) into this country be fixed at 10 percent of domestic production.

2. That the 10-percent figure be based on actual production during the preceding period rather than upon an estimate of the succeeding period.

3. That the military branch of the Federal Government be required to increase their purchases of domestic production, thus stimulating the domestic market and at the same time assisting President Johnson's program to improve our overall balance of trade and arrest the drain on U.S. gold reserves.

4. That no new foreign trade zone areas for petrochemical facilities be established, in order that the domestic industry might share in any increase in demand by virtue of petrochemical operations.

5. That overland importations be limited to actual certificated volumes rather than the nonrestrictive estimates currently in use.

We believe that if these recommendations are followed, the domestic oil industry would experience a significant increase in activity which would benefit a large section of the Nation's economy. Further, we believe that adherence to these proposed mandatory limitations would make a substantial contribution to improving our balance-of-trade deficits and dwindling gold reserves.

TABLE I.—Wyoming property taxes on oil production

Year	Cost	Percent of total property tax
1959	\$10,433,626	26.8
1960	11,540,355	27.6
1961	12,484,673	28.0
1962	13,266,964	27.9
1963	12,873,843	25.6
1964	13,567,337	25.5

Source: Wyoming State Board of Equalization.

TABLE II.—Wyoming crude oil production

Year	Barrels
1959	124,862,652
1960	130,972,284
1961	141,107,000
1962	134,400,000
1963	132,000,000
1964	130,263,275

Source: Petroleum Information, Denver, Colo.

TABLE III.—Wyoming crude oil reserves

Year	Thousands of barrels
1959	1,408,717
1960	1,402,938
1961	1,427,375
1962	1,380,498
1963	1,297,023
1964	1,254,306

Source: IPAA.

TABLE IV.—Exploratory wells drilled in Wyoming

Year	
1959	419
1960	378
1961	388
1962	366
1963	352
1964	360

Source: Petroleum Information.

ONE YEAR LATER—"THE UNITED STATES SHOULD GET OUT OF VIETNAM"

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, this is a speech which 1 year ago I had hoped I would never have to make.

Exactly 1 year ago yesterday, I delivered the first major speech in the Senate on the subject of the tragic war in South Vietnam. That speech was entitled "The United States Should Get Out of Vietnam."

Events in wartorn South Vietnam since I first spoke out on March 10 a year ago have served only to underscore the soundness of my original admonition. Twelve months later—after the expenditure of an additional \$450 million, and after incurring at least 771 additional casualties in U.S. fighting men killed or injured—the United States is in an even worse position to take the war in Vietnam to the conference table than it was when I first urged that course of action on March 10 a year ago.

In my speech at that time, I set forth a detailed analysis of how the United States had gotten itself mired in the steamy jungles of southeast Asia in a bloody foot war.

I pointed out that up to 1954, during the time France had been fighting to reconquer Vietnam after the war, we were helping France in that adventure with money.

I pointed out then that Vietnam had been cruelly ruled and abused by China for a thousand years, and that those who predicted that, if the Vietnamese conflict were taken to the negotiating table, Ho Chi Minh would immediately invite the Chinese Communists to refasten the yoke of subjugation around his neck, just were not taking into account the facts of history.

In my speech on March 10 a year ago, I pointed out that the war in South Vietnam was a civil war, with South Vietnamese relatives fighting South Vietnamese relatives. The majority of the Vietcong are South Vietnamese. That was true a year ago, and it is true today, even though in the interim the number of North Vietnamese infiltrators in South Vietnam may have increased even as has the number of so-called U.S. "advisers."

I said then, and I repeat: The war in South Vietnam is not, and never has been, a United States war. It is, and must remain, a fight to be fought and won by the people of South Vietnam themselves. The will to fight and to win must come from the spirit of the South Vietnamese. The United States cannot instill that will in them.

Since the fall of Diem on November 1, 1963, there has been no stable government in South Vietnam. And the dictatorship of Diem itself, before his fall, had become increasingly cruel and oppressive. No government anywhere can instill in its people a love of country and of government by wholesale deprivation of civil rights, through the harsh use of secret police or through the napalm bombing of women and children suspected of harboring the Vietcong, oftentimes their near relatives.

What was happening in South Vietnam on March 10 of last year, when I

urged that the issues there be brought to the conference table? It was little over a month since General Khanh's coup of January 30, 1964; and the New York Times was headlining the situation as "Vietnam Still Groping Month After Coup—Khanh Regime Fails To Justify Takeover by Military Gain." In the year since then, the headlines indicated in big type, day after day, week after week, month after month, the incompetence of the leaders of South Vietnam to form a government capable either of governing efficiently or of gaining the support of the people. The same black headlines alternately signaled the ups and downs of the Khanh regime, his bickering with U.S. officials, with protest riots permitted and suppressed, and so on and on, through 12 dreary months of erosion of our position in that country.

During this year, the facts fed to the American public were less than frank about the steadily deteriorating situation in South Vietnam. The fact that the number of South Vietnamese becoming sympathetic with the Vietcong cause was growing daily was shrouded in the headlines that Secretary of Defense McNamara was "optimistic over the outcome," or "tells Johnson of gain in Vietnam."

But both before the last year and during the last year, our own conduct—as well as that of the North Vietnamese—was not in accord with the provisions of the Geneva accord of 1954, which, among other things, limited the size of foreign military personnel in Vietnam, and promised elections to be held by July 20, 1956.

On the ground that the situation in North Vietnam would not permit the holding of free elections, the South Vietnamese Government has continued to oppose the holding of the elections called for by the Geneva agreement.

Our so-called military advisers in South Vietnam were steadily increasing, even before the current escalation. The pretense that our military men in South Vietnam were mere advisers was kept up before all the world, long after it became well known that they were in the front lines, fighting—and being killed and wounded—alongside South Vietnamese soldiers.

Our actions in South Vietnam have tarnished our image before the world as a law-abiding nation.

U.S. adherence to the United Nations imposed upon it certain legal obligations under the charter of that organization. That document, the primary purpose of which was to prevent war, imposes certain prerequisites upon the parties to any dispute "likely to endanger the maintenance of international peace and security." There can be little doubt that the activities in South Vietnam constitute a dispute "likely to endanger the maintenance of international peace and security."

What are the duties imposed by the charter of the United Nations upon parties to such a dispute?

First, they must seek a solution by inquiry. This, the United States has not done.

Second, they must seek a solution by mediation. This, the United States has not done.

Third, they must seek a solution by conciliation. This, the United States has not done.

Fourth, they must seek a solution by arbitration. This, the United States has not done.

Fifth, they must seek a solution by judicial settlement. This, the United States has not done.

Sixth, they must seek a solution by resorting "to regional agencies or arrangements." This, the United States has not done.

Seventh, they must seek a solution by resorting to "other peaceful means of their own choice." This, the United States has not done.

Instead, we have escalated the fighting by senseless bombings of installations in North Vietnam, which have succeeded only in frightening and alienating our friends and allies. If the presence of the 7th Fleet off the coast of North Vietnam cannot serve as a deterrent, how can strikes against military staging areas—easily replaceable—accomplish that purpose?

In South Vietnam we are going it alone. Only American fighting men are at the front, being wounded and getting killed, in addition to the South Vietnamese. Our allies of the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization have not sent their troops to fight at the side of the U.S. troops. We do not see in the frontlines in South Vietnam the fighting men from Australia, France, New Zealand, Pakistan, the Philippines, Thailand, or the United Kingdom—the other signatories, along with the United States, of the Southeast Asia Collective Defense Treaty. Of these signatories, only the United States has its men fighting along with the South Vietnamese.

The voices of the people for a negotiation of the war in Vietnam are growing ever greater.

In an excellent article published in the Long Island Press for February 28, 1965, the columnist and radio commentator, Bob Considine, asked the question: "Why Not Negotiate in Vietnam?" He answered the question this way:

It's time to fish or cut bait, a time to halt not doing either, and to hell with face.

There is also a remarkable parallel between our actions in Vietnam and those of the French up until the disaster at Dienbienphu. True, we are not, and never have been, trying to reimpose colonialism upon the Vietnamese people. But Diem was our man—we told the world so—and we were using AID money to propagandize the countryside, thus building up a false image for Diem, at the very time when his secret police were cruelly harassing the people, and the Vietnamese Air Force—in U.S. planes—was bombing women and children. Diem's image became our image.

Is there any wonder why so many of the South Vietnamese lack the desire to fight—why South Vietnamese soldiers cannot be trusted to protect sleeping U.S. troops?

In an interesting introduction to a new book, entitled "The Battle of Dienbienphu" by the French author Jules Roy, Mr. Neil Sheehan, of the New York Times, sets out admirably the parallel

between the French and the U.S. situations.

In the Nation for March 1, 1965, Mr. Frederick Kuh analyzes the "Prospects in Vietnam." In discussing possible Chinese intervention as a result of our continued air strikes into North Vietnam, Mr. Kuh states:

Chinese interventions could come in phases: First, air support in attacking U.S. aircraft and air strikes against South Vietnam; then the assignment of so-called volunteers to North Vietnam, freeing the North Vietnamese army to move south; finally, the Chinese themselves might move south with the North Vietnamese.

The able and distinguished Senator from South Dakota [Mr. McGOVERN], has written for the Progressive of March 1965, an excellent, thought-provoking article entitled "Affirmative Alternative in Vietnam." I commend him highly for the astuteness shown in the article and for the stand he has taken.

On March 7, 1965, there appeared in the New York Times an excellent editorial entitled "The One-Way Street." One of the major conclusions of this editorial is the statement:

If the present American policy of widening the war and refusing to consider negotiations at this time forces Moscow back toward the East, Communist China will be the gainer.

Yesterday morning's New York Times contained a leading editorial entitled "A Negotiation is a Negotiation." The editorial pointed to the precipitate haste with which the Department of State had rejected out of hand the proposal by the Secretary General of the United Nations for a seven-nation parlay on Vietnam. The editorial points out that the United States will negotiate only if our terms are accepted before negotiations begin. So why negotiate?

As has been pointed out, all wars ultimately end in negotiations. Why not negotiate the Vietnam crisis now?

The New York Times editorial refers to President Kennedy's remarks on September 2, 1963, to the effect that the Vietnamese must win this war since it is their war. But the editorial then points out:

President Johnson, on the contrary—

Despite the statement that we want no wider wars—

has now changed this policy and is trying to win the war with American arms and American forces on behalf of the South Vietnamese. This is impossible, because as Mr. Kennedy said, "It is their war"—although it is of course true that the North Vietnamese are supplying increasing help to one side, as the United States is to the other.

I ask unanimous consent that the article published in the Long Island Press for February 28, 1965; the introduction to the book, "The Battle of Dienbienphu," by Jules Roy; the March 1, 1965, article in the Nation, by Frederick Kuh; Senator McGovern's article in the Progressive of March 1965; and editorials in the New York Times of March 7, 1965, and March 10, 1965, be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

Mr. President, 1 year ago today, I called for an end to the senseless killing in South Vietnam. From time to time

during the year that has passed, I have renewed that call for an immediate ceasefire and the beginning of negotiations on Vietnam. I again renew that call, in the same words I used a year ago: The time has come to cease the useless and senseless losses of American lives in an area not essential to the security of the United States, the whole of which is not worth the loss of a single American soldier.

There being no objection, the matters submitted by Mr. GRUENING were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows: [From the Long Island Press, Feb. 28, 1965]

WHY NOT NEGOTIATE IN VIETNAM?

(By Bob Considine)

So what's wrong with negotiating over our predicament in Vietnam?

Are we worried over loss of face? A nation which could turn the enemy world into cinder if we ever went berserk instead of benign, which has more money, goods, know-how, prestige, generosity and compassion than the rest of the powers put together, does not have to worry about loss of face. But if we continue to support the insupportable chaos of Vietnam, we will lower the high regard our allies hold for us as sensible, hard-nosed realists.

The United Nations may need an oil change and a motto tuneup, but it is still enough of a vehicle to carry us out of the hapless bind we've found ourselves in for a decade. It was formed 20 years ago to take care of all the little Vietnams that were to follow in mankind's existence.

There is in its charter and varied committees every bit of machinery needed to effect a settlement that will permit us to become one of many overseers of that troubled area of the earth, not the principal foreign participant and bankroll.

It would not be a settlement to end all doubts and troubles. They don't build settlements like that any more. But it would be one which would permit us, with dignity, to pull back to what might be a board of directors, instead of serving as president and chief executive officer.

SEATO was put together in 1954 for this specific area cancer. We are no more nor less a part of the pact than is Great Britain, France, Australia, New Zealand, Pakistan, the Philippines, and Thailand. But alongside our contribution in blood and treasure the efforts of other free world countries in Vietnam have been minuscule.

If the U.N. took up the question of this war between the rival Viet mobs—the Reds in the north of the country against the musical chairs generals and mandarins in Saigon—we would not have to sit at the same table or break bread with Red China. They don't belong to the club.

If there came a day when we pulled out our 23,500 "advisers," after some kind of accord along the lines of the Korean armistice and the rickety but existing neutrality of the remainder of old Indochina, it would not automatically follow that the "Red Chinese" would take over.

The peoples of southeast Asia have been fighting Chinese of all ideological hues for several thousand years. They are not going to stop resisting them the day the ink dries on a negotiated peace. What the ordinary people of North and South Vietnam desperately want is an end to a war that is of scant interest to them when compared to the overwhelming burdens of daily work, feeding themselves and their children, trying for a little better life, and avoiding as much as they can the taxation and tyranny imposed on them as much by their own troops as by the enemy.

There are many sincere people who believe that if we "pull out" of Vietnam we'll be jerking the rug from under Japan and Tai-

wan and setting up a situation which may one day see us fighting Communist hordes on Waikiki Beach.

If anything remotely that awful loomed, it's a cinch we wouldn't wait until they advanced that far, nor would allies who would have equally as much or more to lose by not pitching in. Those allies, I'm convinced, would include the Soviet Union. The Russians would have the most to lose in any huge eruption of the Asian peoples and dislocation of present-day spheres of strength in Japan, Taiwan, Okinawa, Philippines, Australia, and so forth.

Secretary Rusk says "no negotiating until the North Vietnamese cease aggression." Former Ambassador Henry Cabot Lodge, whose low estimate of President Diem proved depressingly wrong, says it would be as senseless to negotiate with the North Viets now as to try to cure smallpox with cold cream.

We have given up the pretense of not using American-manned jets against Vietcong guerrillas and are publicly blasting away. One proud announcement claimed we had mowed down 100 of the VC's in a low-level raid made at close to the speed of sound, if not supersonic. The communique did not list the number of friends we probably killed in the process.

You can't bomb communism, any more than an enemy attack on this country would destroy democracy, or the Luftwaffe's blitz on London destroyed British pride. But communism can be contained. We proved that when we helped France, Italy, Brazil, Venezuela, and a host of other countries to surmount its challenge.

We would bring a world of talent and persuasion to the Vietnam peace table, dominate it if we chose—which is something we're most reluctant to do in Vietnam. It's time to fish or cut bait, a time to halt not doing either; and to hell with fate.

THE BATTLE OF DIENBIENPHU

(By Jules Roy)

In July of 1963, 9 years after the debacle at Dienbienphu, Denis Warner, the Australian journalist, told me how astounded he was to find the American generals in South Vietnam deluding themselves with the same false optimism the French generals had professed during the first Indochina war.

Warner, who has spent the last 15 years covering southeast Asia, had just returned from a trip through the villages and rice paddies of the Mekong Delta south of the capital. The delta was the most important area in the country. The majority of the population and the bulk of the economic resources were concentrated there and the outcome of the struggle in the delta would decide the war. Warner noted sadly that the Saigon government's position was crumbling there just as rapidly under the hammer blows of the Vietcong guerrillas as the French position in the Tonkin Delta in North Vietnam had eroded under pressure from the Vietminh insurgents in 1952.

On his return to Saigon, however, Warner had been shocked to hear the American generals assure him with the same false confidence the French had shown, that they were winning the war in the delta. They had cited similarly meaningless statistics on the number of guerrillas supposedly killed and on the number of fortified hamlets that had been built. "I'll bet I could dig out my old notebooks and find almost identical statements by the French," Warner said.

Nine years after the disaster at Dienbienphu had ended more than 80 years of French rule in Indochina, much remained unchanged. The French generals and diplomats had departed, leaving their reputations molding in the rice paddies. But they had been followed by American generals and diplomats who suffered, or were about to suffer, the same fate for similar reasons. The

March 11, 1965

4746

young French officers and foreign legionnaires who had soothed their frayed nerves in the cabarets and bars on Catinat Street were gone or resting forever beneath the Tricolor in the military cemetery near the airport. But the slim Vietnamese prostitutes, their long black hair gracing the shoulders of skin-tight tunics, were still swinging their legs from the bar stools and still warming their beds with foreign soldiers.

The decadent emperor, Bao Dai, was living in exile on the Riviera, but he had been replaced by the Ngo Dinh, a stiff-necked and self-righteous family who ruled with the unbending arrogance of the ancient mandarins. The head of the family, President Ngo Dinh Diem, a plump little man who waddled like a duck when he walked, was sitting in his air-conditioned office in the presidential palace, isolated from the people by his own choice, surrounded by sycophants and security policemen and convinced he ruled by divine right.

In a nearby office sat his younger brother, Ngo Dinh Nhu. Nhu was a French-educated intellectual. He was delicately built. His long and graceful fingers perpetually held a cigarette and he spoke in a low, rasping voice. He had become a victim of his own talent for intrigue, however, and of his contempt for the rest of the human race. Each day he was plunging the regime further into a suicidal struggle with the Buddhist clergy which would end in the overthrow of the family and the assassination of himself and his brother 4 months later. His beautiful wife, Madame Ngo Dinh Nhu, who fancied herself the rightful empress of Vietnam, goaded Nhu and her brother-in-law deeper in their folly. She had poured all her woman's passion into the pursuit of power and was consumed by rage at those who dared to challenge her. She taunted the priests and dared them to "barbecue" another of their number.

Each time a Buddhist priest spilled gasoline over his body and lit himself afire in protest against the family's arrogance, the restlessness and anger of the population grew until finally the generals moved their battalions into the city and the infantry stormed the presidential palace as the tank guns barked.

The enemy were no longer called the Vietminh. They were now known as the Vietcong (Vietnamese Communists), but they were the same black-clad little men, lean and hardened by years of warfare, determined to finish the revolution they had begun against the French in 1945 and to unite Vietnam under their rule. They were just as cunning and resourceful and just as intensely self-critical as they had been when they stood on the heights and looked down into the valley of Dienbienphu. They were still just as willing as they had been then to pay the price to achieve their ends and, most important of all, they were again winning the war.

At home in the United States, most Americans, just as the French before them, were too preoccupied with their own lives to become interested in a war in a small Asian country thousands of miles away which they felt didn't concern them directly. Many probably didn't even know where Vietnam was.

Malcolm Browne, of the Associated Press, had recently received a letter from an American business firm addressed to him at "Saigon, French Indonesia." Malcolm immediately sat down and wrote a lengthy reply, patiently explaining that Saigon was in a country called Vietnam, in a region called Indochina, that there had been a long war in Indochina in which thousands of Frenchmen and Vietnamese had died and that there was another long war raging there now in which Americans were dying.

A helicopter pilot back from leave in the United States laughed and told how one of

his civilian neighbors had asked him where he was stationed. When he said he was stationed in Saigon, the neighbor had replied: "Well, it's a good thing you're not in that Vietnam. They're shooting down a lot of helicopters over there."

The U.S. Information Service theater was showing a documentary film entitled, "The End of An Empire." Much of the footage had been filmed by Russian cameramen who had accompanied the Vietminh battalions in the war against the French. There were scenes of the Vietminh, thousands of them, singing as they dragged their cannons across the mountains toward Dienbienphu, fading into the jungle when the French planes appeared and then rushing forward in screaming waves to overwhelm the French garrison. Many of us who saw the film were frightened by it. It showed us how formidable was the enemy our country was now facing.

Jules Roy's account of the battle of Dienbienphu is an important book for the American reader, primarily because it will help him to understand his own country's often bewildering role in South Vietnam.

The 9 years of war between the French and the Vietminh, which climaxed at Dienbienphu, brought 17 million people in North Vietnam under Communist rule and left the economy of Indochina in chaos. Most important, the fact that the Communists had led the anticolonial struggle enabled them to claim it was they who had driven the French from the nation's soil and that they thus constituted the true nationalist elite within the country. This gave them enormous political credit with the Vietnamese peasantry, who have deep nationalist feelings. The President of North Vietnam, Ho Chi Minh, is still the greatest nationalist leader in the country to much of the peasantry, and the Communists drew deeply and successfully on this credit with the peasantry when, in 1957, they launched what might be called the Second Indochina War against the U.S.-backed government of the Ngo family.

Tens of thousands of Vietnamese men and women who might otherwise have shunned the Communists, had also joined the fight against the French because of an overwhelming desire to achieve national independence. Among them were many of the most talented and patriotic individuals in the country. During the war they had either been absorbed into the Communist ranks or cleverly and brutally silenced in the purges which followed the final victory. Other nationalist elements had either atrophied because they refused to take either side or had joined the French in the fight against the Communists, hoping to achieve independence later by political means, but instead compromising themselves in the eyes of the population because of their collaboration with the hated foreigner.

Thus, when the United States assumed responsibility for South Vietnam in 1954, the human resources the Americans could work with to attempt to build a viable nation-state constituted a mere residue. It was a residue shrunken by years of hesitation, compromise, and collaboration, riven by factions and intrigue, its moral fiber weakened by the corruption which had flourished under the French in the venal administration of Bao Dai.

Unfortunately, the United States was to worsen an already perilous situation by committing a series of blunders of its own. Under the pressure of a renewed Communist revolution, these blunders were to lead toward the impending defeat which is now threatening us in South Vietnam. And this impending defeat, although it will in all likelihood lack the drama of Dienbienphu, may be just as calamitous in its effects.

I believe that historians who search in years to come for the causes underlying the

American defeat in South Vietnam will find themselves discovering reasons somewhat similar to those which Roy believes brought the earlier French defeat at Dienbienphu.

The debacle occurred, Roy explains, not because of a shortage of men, guns or bullets, but for other, more important and intangible reasons. These were the arrogance and the vanity of the French military and political leaders, their self-delusion and moral weakness and their contempt for the Asian enemy.

The most significant aspects of this book, therefore, are not the details of the battle itself, which unfolded with the grim fatalism of a Greek tragedy once the combatants met, but the motives and reasoning which led the French to deliberately risk battle with the Vietminh at Dienbienphu and to commit their best parachute and Foreign Legion battalions to that valley from which so many failed to return.

General Henri Navarre, the French Commander in Chief in Indochina, decided to risk battle at Dienbienphu, Roy writes, because he believed, on the basis of classic Western military axioms, that he could inflict a stunning defeat on the Vietminh there. According to General Navarre, the Vietminh commander, General Vo Nguyen Giap, lacked the logistic capacity to concentrate enough troops to overwhelm the garrison. General Navarre believed the French artillery and airpower would pulverize any artillery the Vietminh attempted to emplace on the heights overlooking the valley. He was certain that these weapons, in combination with his tanks and machineguns, would decimate the Vietminh infantry battalions once they descended into the valley itself. He thought he would be able to keep the two airfields in the valley open during the battle to supply and reinforce the garrison. Dienbienphu ended the search for the classic, set-piece battle in which the French hoped to bring the destructive power of modern technology to bear on the elusive Communist enemy and smash him with an iron fist.

General Navarre and his staff grossly underestimated the skill and the resources of their enemy. They did not realize that these Western military axioms would not only fail to succeed against the revolutionary, politico-military strategy of the enemy, but would actually lead to disaster.

Ironically, as I recall from my 2 years in Vietnam as a reporter, the responsible American diplomatic and military officials there knew very little of the earlier French experience. If they had bothered to study it they might have seen some of the fatal weaknesses of the French reflected in themselves and drawn back before it was too late.

Listening to the Americans one got the impression that the French had fought badly and deserved to lose. In any case, they said, the French had been attempting to maintain an outdated colonial system and thus were doomed to failure. They, the Americans, knew how to fight wars, since they had defeated the Nazis and the Japanese and had bludgeoned the Chinese Communists to a stalemate in Korea. They were also fighting for democratic ideals and deserved victory since communism is bad and democracy is good.

The Americans, however, did not know that the French Expeditionary Corps had usually fought with more bravery and determination than the Vietnamese Government troops they were arming and advising. The Americans did not realize that courage alone was not enough to defeat an enemy with the cunning and resourcefulness of the Vietminh, or the Vietcong as they were now called. The Americans also forgot that many Vietnamese peasants saw little difference between the corrupt and brutal administrators of the Ngo family regime the United States was trying to preserve and those who had plagued them during the earlier French days.

March 11, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

4747

The basic reason for the steady growth of Communist control and influence over the South Vietnamese peasantry from 1957 to 1961 had been the corruption, the nepotism, and the maladministration of the Ngo family government. At the time the United States began its massive commitment of men, money, and prestige to South Vietnam in the fall of 1961, however, Washington made only a halfhearted attempt to force the Ngo family to carry out critically needed political and administrative reforms. The reforms might have won the regime the support among the peasantry it so desperately needed.

When the attempt failed, Washington and its generals and diplomats in South Vietnam somehow convinced themselves that the Ngo family has been popular anyway. President Ngo Dinh Diem was "widely respected in the countryside," journalists were told and the regime was rallying its people around it in "a great national movement" to sweep the Vietcong from the country, to quote the former American Ambassador in Saigon, Frederick Nolting, Jr.

Like the French before them, the Americans placed their faith in classic Western military axioms and in practice sought a conventional military solution. They paid lip-service to the political and psychological aspects of the war, but in their hearts they believed they could safely ignore these and somehow overwhelm the Vietcong with their vast amounts of money and materiel, their thousands of advisers, and the helicopters, fighter-bombers, armored vehicles, and artillery batteries they were pouring into the country.

I remember with what confidence Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara assured us, in a briefing at the end of his first visit to Vietnam in May of 1962, that the war was being won. Still dressed in the khaki shirt, trousers, and hiking shoes he had worn during a tour of the countryside, his notebooks filled with information gathered by hundreds of questions, Mr. McNamara was certain that the massive American aid program, then barely 5 months old, was already having effect and that the Vietcong would soon begin weakening under the pressure.

When a skeptical reporter said he could not believe Mr. McNamara was this optimistic the Secretary replied: "Every quantitative measurement we have shows we're winning this war."

The American commander in South Vietnam, Gen. Paul D. Harkins, and his staff sat in their air-conditioned offices in Saigon and waxed optimistic on the same kind of supposedly impressive statistics the French had comforted themselves with during the first Indochina war. They pointed to the number of operations the Government commanders were launching, to the mobility the American helicopters and armored personnel carriers had given the Government infantry, and to the thousands of guerrillas they were supposedly killing with their fighter-bombers, artillery, and automatic weapons. Like his French predecessor, General Navarre, General Harkins was a polite and urbane man who had built a reputation as a brilliant staff officer. Perhaps they also both shared the limitations of the Western-trained staff officer confronted with the subtleties of an Asian-style Communist revolution.

Just as bad news was not tolerated in the tranquil rooms of General Navarre's headquarters, so it was also not tolerated in General Harkins' headquarters or in the American Embassy in Saigon. In this unreal atmosphere, where doctrine and theory were defended as facts, anything which contradicted the official optimism was simply ignored or derided as false or inconsequential.

Roy relates how General Navarre refused to believe intelligence reports from the staff of his subordinate in Hanoi, Maj. Gen. René

Cogny, that the Vietminh were concentrating the bulk of four infantry divisions on Dienbienphu—a formidable force which would seriously threaten the garrison. "Cogny's team was accused of adopting a spurious pessimism in order to exaggerate the importance of Tonkin and to warn Navarre's team not to infringe on its jurisdiction."

The concentration of four Vietminh divisions at Dienbienphu was regarded by the French as a "utopian project." The French had calculated on the basis of Western military doctrine that the enemy simply did not have the logistic capabilities to supply and maintain such a force far from its bases. General Navarre, Roy writes, "believed that he would be faced with only one division, though considerably reinforced; in other words, about a dozen battalions with a few heavy guns. That was nothing to be alarmed about." Unfortunately for General Navarre, the Vietminh did concentrate and maintain the bulk of four divisions at Dienbienphu, by improvising unorthodox but effective means of moving supplies and overwhelming his garrison.

With similar dogmatism, General Harkins and his staff ignored or derided reports in the late summer of 1963 from junior officers in the field that the Vietnamese government's position in the Mekong Delta was deteriorating seriously and that the vaunted strategic hamlet program which was to separate the guerrillas from the peasantry was crumbling under Communist attacks. The reports also warned that the Vietcong were creating large but highly mobile infantry battalions armed with captured American-made weapons which would soon pose a grave challenge to the government forces.

Miss Marguerite Higgins, then covering the war for the Herald Tribune, whose dispatches from South Vietnam faithfully reflected the official point of view, wrote in August of that year:

"But as of this moment, General Harkins and his staff flatly contradict published reports that South Vietnam's U.S.-backed fight against the Communists—particularly in the rice-rich delta—is 'deteriorating' and that a Vietcong buildup is taking place to the point where the Communists will be able to conduct mobile warfare with battalions as well equipped as the government's."

As late as October General Harkins assured another journalist: "I can tell you categorically that we are winning in the Mekong Delta."

That November, taking advantage of the dislocation immediately following the fall of the Ngo family regime, the Vietcong unleashed their battalions in a series of dazzling attacks which inflicted irreparable damage on the government's already fragile position in the delta.

The junior American officers who realized what was happening and attempted to bring their superiors in Saigon to their senses, just as some of the lower-ranking French officers had tried to warn General Navarre of the debacle he was creating, wasted their energy. Their reports aroused only irritation and Saigon focused its attention on silencing them instead of abandoning its own illusions.

"Nobody believed in the strategic mobility and logistics of the Vietminh," Roy writes. "Nobody, or scarcely anybody, in the French Army had enough imagination to guess at the enemy's cunning and wisdom."

He notes that Lt. Gen. Raoul Salan, General Navarre's predecessor as commander in chief in Indochina, regarded the Vietminh commander, General Giap, "as a noncommissioned officer learning to handle regiments" and that General Navarre himself made only a halfhearted attempt to understand General Giap.

"Navarre should have kept a photograph of Giap before him at all times in his study," Roy comments, "as Montgomery kept a photograph of Rommel before him during the

Egyptian campaign. Perhaps he thought that this would have been paying too much honor to a man who had not attended courses in military strategy and to whom the title of general was given only in quotation marks."

Most of the American generals likewise despised the enemy. They were fond of asserting that the Vietcong commanders were unsophisticated Asians who lacked knowledge of modern warfare. The Vietcong were frequently referred to as "those raggedy little bastards in black pajamas."

"The Vietcong aren't 10 feet tall, they're only 5 feet tall," journalists were told, "and we're going to cut them down even further before we're through." I recall how one American general confidently assured me that "the Vietcong are Vietnamese too and they've got the same failings as these government guys we're supporting. You've got to remember that these people are all pretty unsophisticated and they don't have the military tradition we've got."

Many of the Americans also did not believe in the mobility the Vietcong had gained through their control and influence over the peasantry, their clever use of motorized sampans along the thousands of canals which crisscrossed the countryside, their ability to fight at night and the stamina they had drilled into their infantry.

Miss Higgins quotes one of General Harkins' officers as saying:

"What is mobility? Mobility means vehicles and aircraft. You have seen the way our Vietnamese units are armed—50 radios, 30 or 40 vehicles, rockets, mortars and airplanes. The Vietcong have no vehicles and no airplanes. How can they be mobile?"

Finally, there were the governments back home in Washington and Paris. The successive, weak French cabinets did not want to think very much about Indochina and carefully avoided troublesome decisions on the conduct of the war. Nine years later, the administration in Washington similarly did not want to hear disturbing news about its war in South Vietnam and scrupulously dodged politically sensitive decisions.

"Once in a while Washington remembers that there is a war in South Vietnam," Max Frankel of the New York Times reported in July of 1963. "But for long stretches, the war against Communist-led guerrillas in Vietnam fades from memory here, not because no one cares, but because the men who care most decided long ago to discuss it as little as possible."

"It [administration] concedes that President Ngo Dinh Diem has often treated his own intellectuals and officers as more dangerous than the guerrillas, that he resists the decentralization of authority and that he has not done nearly enough to win the loyalty of his largely rural population."

"But every reluctant comment here ends on the same note: that there is no alternative, no intention to seek one, no change of policy and no further comment."

"All they want, officials indicate, is to get on quietly with the war."

The Vietminh commander, General Giap, said to Roy in 1963 as he was leaving Hanoi for a visit to the old battleground at Dienbienphu:

"If you were defeated, you were defeated by yourselves." Perhaps General Giap will make a similar remark to an American writer someday.

NEIL SHEEHAN.

(Mr. Sheehan was the correspondent for United Press International in Vietnam from April 1962 until April 1964, and is currently with the New York Times.)

[From the Nation, Mar. 1, 1965]

PROSPECTS IN VIETNAM

(By Frederick Kuh)

The United States is in a period of doubt, confusion and danger concerning Vietnam. What are the prospects?

March 11, 1965

1. The reaction to America's present program of airstrikes may be so intense in other countries—in the United Nations, Britain, the U.S.S.R. and France—that the United States will be forced by these third parties to come to a negotiating table either at the United Nations, at Geneva or elsewhere. There may be a strong call for a cease-fire and an attempt to get each side at least privately to indicate its basic conditions for negotiations. Britain has sent one of its responsible Foreign Office officials, George Thompson, to Moscow for talks with the Soviet Government.

2. A massive Chinese intervention and a U.S. response could mean full-scale war in southeast Asia. It would be a ground war because Chinese intervention would move rapidly from air to ground since its air power is not great.

This, it is believed, would force the United States into a ground response like Korea and would present it with grim decisions as to what weapons to use. Here again, third powers would try to bring about a cease-fire and negotiations, but this would be far more difficult once Chinese and U.S. ground forces were committed.

Chinese interventions could come in phases: First, air support in attacking U.S. aircraft and air strikes against South Vietnam; then the assignment of so-called volunteers to North Vietnam, freeing the North Vietnamese army to move south; finally, the Chinese themselves might move south with the North Vietnamese.

3. South Vietnamese initiative could take the form either of a coup d'état, replacing the present government with a neutralist regime that would invite the United States to leave; or South Vietnamese private conversations with the Vietcong might arrange a settlement behind Uncle Sam's back and halt the war before it grows bigger.

Informed authorities regard this alternative as relatively unlikely at the moment, since the country is enjoying a temporary unity and euphoria as a result of the American air strikes against the north. However, it might come as a reaction to the second alternative—as the South Vietnamese became concerned about turning the whole country into a massive battlefield.

4. This alternative—called "very unlikely" in Washington—would be for the United States to pull out under domestic, for instance, congressional pressure.

Two lines of development are going on simultaneously. One is intensification of U.S. strikes against the North, leading at some point to Chinese Communist intervention and more general warfare. The second is domestic and international pressure toward a negotiated solution. The key question is whether the pressure will bring negotiations before the Chinese intervene—that is, at what point will the United States be forced to stop its air strikes and sit down at the conference table?

[From the Progressive, Mar. 1965]

AFFIRMATIVE ALTERNATIVE IN VIETNAM (By SENATOR GEORGE S. McGOVERN)

To anyone taking a hard-headed, realistic look at the situation in South Vietnam it is somewhat puzzling that the terms "hard line" and "soft line" seem to be reversed when discussing that nation on the other side of the world. Where Vietnam is concerned, those who discount the present and offer only hopes for the future are considered "hard" whereas those who look at the actual situation and point to the current map of Communist-controlled areas of Vietnam are accused of following a "soft line."

It is both hard—in the sense of being difficult—and hard-headed—in the sense of being realistic—to admit honestly to ourselves what the facts are.

We are not winning in South Vietnam. We are backing a government there that is incapable either of winning a military struggle or governing its people. We are fighting a determined army of guerrillas that seems to enjoy the cooperation of the people in the countryside and that grows stronger in the face of foreign intervention, be it Japanese, French, or American. In this circumstance, the proposal to expand the American military involvement would be an act of folly designed in the end to create a larger, more inglorious debacle.

For nearly a quarter of a century, southeast Asia has been torn by military and political conflict. First, there was the Japanese invasion of World War II. Then came nearly a decade of struggle with the French culminating in the collapse of the French army at Dienbienphu in 1954. The French lost the cream of their army in an unsuccessful effort to reestablish French control over Indochina, U.S. aid totaling \$2 billion financed eighty percent of the French war effort.

Then came the gradually deepening American involvement in Southeast Asia in the ten years after 1954. American expenditures in Vietnam, in addition to \$2 billion in aid to the French, now approach \$4 billion, and 243 American have died trying to counsel and assist the Vietnamese forces.

Yet we are further away from victory over the guerrilla forces in Vietnam today than we were a decade ago. The recent confrontation of the Vietcong Communist guerrillas and the South Vietnamese army at Bin Ghia was a painful, dramatic demonstration that the struggle is going badly for our side. Government prestige was hurt seriously in that battle. Communist stock has gone up. Concerned Americans are asking, "What has gone wrong?" and it seems a fair question.

In my judgment, the first answer is that South Vietnam is not basically a military problem but a political one. Neither the Diem regime nor its successors has won the political loyalty and active support of the people of South Vietnam, especially those who live outside town and city limits.

There are rarely military answers to political dilemma of this nature. Military proposals in South Vietnam, whether for special forces, strategic hamlets, insurgency programs, or more suitably-designed airplanes are not likely to overcome the political weaknesses of the existing South Vietnamese Government. Even the sophisticated weapons of the nuclear age cannot override the basic precepts of successful government.

This is a political problem, and it is a South Vietnamese problem. The United States can accomplish much through foreign aid and military support, but we cannot create strong, effective, and popular national leadership where that leadership either does not exist or does not exert itself. That is not only expensive and impractical, it is just plain impossible.

For 9 years the U.S. helped the Diem government at a cost of \$8 billion. Diem's rule was marked by the achievement of some measure of economic stability, but principally by an increasing political disaffection. That disaffection was encouraged by North Vietnam, but basically Diem's own arbitrary rule made possible Vietcong gains. The very fact that Vietcong strength was and still is greatest in the Mekong Delta and around Saigon—more than a thousand miles away from North Vietnam—indicates that there is basic popular support for the guerrillas among the South Vietnamese peasants.

It is not isolationism, either of the old variety or the new, to recognize that U.S. advisers, however able, are simply no substitute for a competent and popular indigenous government. It is not idealism either; it is simply realism. Only the Vietnamese themselves can provide the leaders and the sustained support to defeat the Vietcong. The

United States can at most only hold a finger in the dike until the South Vietnamese find themselves. Therefore, even at this 11th hour, when there is mounting pressure to send more U.S. troops to South Vietnam and enlarge the conflict, we must be hard-headed realists.

Americans in Asia are basically aliens, of a different race, religion, and culture. Moreover, the Vietnamese are nationalistic and race-conscious in their outlook. As an on-the-scene observer pointed out, "If you imagine a Chinese sheriff speaking Cantonese and trying to keep order in Tombstone, Ariz., in its heyday, you will begin to understand the problem."

More American troops, in addition to the 25,000 now in South Vietnam, would not necessarily mean more success, because victory in the Vietnam countryside depends on accurate intelligence information, peasant support, and quick action by Vietnamese troops. These factors cannot be controlled by Americans. They must depend on the South Vietnamese, and we must recognize that fact.

The more Americans are brought in to do what should be the responsibility of the Vietnamese Government, the greater will be the tendency of the Vietnamese Government to rely on United States advisers rather than on able Vietnamese; the greater will be the prestige of the Vietcong and North Vietnamese for holding at bay not merely their own countrymen but also the gathered might of the United States; and, finally, the greater will be the grassroots reaction against Americans. In theory, our Government has recognized that the South Vietnamese bear primary responsibility for the war and civilian policies. In practice, Americans have assumed roles of increasing influence and leadership with slight military gains but disturbing deterioration on the local political level.

I for one am very much opposed to the policy, now gaining support in Washington, of extending the war to the north. I am disturbed by the recent reports of American air strikes in Laos and North Vietnam.

Attacks on North Vietnam will not seriously weaken guerrilla fighters a thousand miles away, fighters who depend for 80 percent of their weapons on captured United States equipment and for food on a sympathetic local peasantry. The principal foe is not the limited industrial capacity of North Vietnam, not the North Vietnamese who have remained at home, nor even their training camps and trails. It is the 30,000 individual guerrilla fighters from North and South who have no trouble finding sanctuary within South Vietnam or the neighboring states of Laos and Cambodia. Bombing North Vietnam is not calculated to reduce their determination, but undoubtedly it would antagonize many other Asians and could easily lead to increased Communist Chinese involvement in the whole Indo-Chinese peninsula.

The only viable policy for the United States in Vietnam is negotiation and a political settlement. Until such time as negotiation is possible and a settlement can be devised which does not surrender South Vietnam to communism, the United States would doubtless not find it feasible to withdraw. But the aim of our current policy must be seen as a prelude to diplomatic settlement and not an occasion for war against North Vietnam, or, even worse, Communist China.

There are many different ways to approach such a diplomatic settlement. Last August, I suggested we might take up French President Charles de Gaulle's proposal for an international conference, including the United States, the Soviet Union, Britain, France, China, Malaya, Thailand, Laos, Cambodia, Burma, Canada, Poland, India, and North and South Vietnam. More recently,

March 11, 1965

4749

Walter Lippmann raised the possibility of a Congress of Asia. The groundwork for any such gathering would have to be carefully laid and therefore, for the present, the first step should probably be informal approaches to the interested nations and preliminary private talks.

What are the objectives or terms on which we might be willing to put an end to fighting in South Vietnam? If military victory is impossible—as I believe it is—we can settle only on the kind of terms that would be generally acceptable to North Vietnam. Yet, equally clearly, we cannot simply walk out and permit the Vietcong to march into Saigon.

The minimum terms which might be acceptable on both sides would probably include:

Closer association or confederation between North and South Vietnam, not under a unitary Communist government from the North, but with local autonomy for the South as well as the North.

Renewed trade and rail links between North and South Vietnam, which admittedly would be most useful to the North where there is a pressing need for the food grown in the South.

Cooperative planning to benefit North and South Vietnam from the Mekong River development. For the South, it would mean primarily flood control. For the North, now outside the Mekong watershed, it could mean hydroelectric power for industry.

Neutralization of North and South Vietnam, including guarantees that foreign troops and military advisers would gradually be eliminated. Although this is a key point, it would not by any means eliminate all U.S. military forces from Asia nor would it bar AID and other civilian advisers. At the same time it would represent some protection to North Vietnam from the North as well as the South.

Establishment of a United Nations presence or unit in southeast Asia with the right to enter every country, to guarantee national borders, to offer protection against external aggression, and, insofar as possible, to insure fair treatment of tribal and other minorities.

Would such terms be acceptable to North Vietnam? Why should Ho Chi Minh settle for even half a loaf if he sees the prospect for ultimate victory or thinks the United States might soon be ready to pull out altogether?

Actually, North Vietnam cannot benefit, any more than South Vietnam, from a prolonged conflict; both have much to fear from any spread of the war, even subversion or infiltration. The North Vietnamese know what happened to the people and resources of North Korea during that war.

Moreover, although Hanoi, of North Vietnam, is closely allied to Communist China, the Vietnamese have for centuries regarded the Chinese with suspicion. Obviously, Peiping's desire to exert hegemony over Indochina runs directly contrary to all Vietnamese ambitions. Escalation of the war by the United States would make North Vietnam increasingly dependent on China and strengthen, not Ho Chi Minh's influence, but, rather, Mao Tse-tung's. In fact, apart from China, no nation has anything to gain from a long drawn out struggle in Vietnam. Only China gains from continuing confusion and weakness in Vietnam. Only China gains, in time and resources so that it will be better able at some future time to exert its influence in southeast Asia.

France, with considerable property in North and South Vietnam, is eager for peace, putting economic stability ahead of almost any political denouement. Great Britain, which has a conflict between Malaysia and Indonesia, has never really endorsed U.S. policy in South Vietnam.

Even the Soviet Union can be expected to give quiet support to policies designed to prevent expansion of the fighting and to reduce Peiping's influence in southeast Asia. In fact, new links between Moscow and Hanoi are being forged right now, both economic and diplomatic. Moscow's influence could well be thrown, as it was in 1954, toward a negotiated settlement in southeast Asia.

The United States certainly is not anxious for broader commitments on the Asian mainland, but the key element in U.S. thinking is whether a negotiated settlement would merely pave the way for a Communist takeover in South Vietnam or elsewhere. To that question there can be no simple answer, for it would depend on the abilities of the South Vietnamese to form a government with popular support and with the ability to cooperate in some fields with the North without losing its own independence. To be realistic any settlement in the foreseeable future will have to replace the present hostility between North and South with greater economic cooperation and more political acceptance. The policies and directions that Vietnam takes will depend on the character of the leadership from Saigon as well as Hanoi. The United States can help that leadership in a number of ways, but in this nationalistic era, the United States cannot offer American leadership or American soldiers as a substitute for popular and effective government from Saigon.

[From the New York Times, Mar. 7, 1965]

THE ONE-WAY STREET

The wider war which the United States is now fighting in Vietnam is, in present circumstances, a one-way street.

If the present American strategy of carrying the war to North Vietnam works, Hanoi will cease training and supplying the Vietcong and will do what it can—which may not be nearly so much as the United States hopes—to call off the guerrillas. Despite what Washington keeps saying, there really is a species of civil war in South Vietnam. It takes the now common form of revolutionary guerrilla warfare, which the populace—in this case the peasantry—either passively accepts or actively aids. So even if American strategy in North Vietnam is successful, there is no reason to suppose that the Vietcong in South Vietnam will end their internal war against whatever government happens to be installed in Saigon.

But if the strategy does not work, the United States will face the necessity of escalating the war against North Vietnam still further. To do anything less would be to admit defeat.

Yet there is inherently a tacit admission of failure in this new American strategy. It became clear that the original purpose in aiding South Vietnam—to help establish an independent, strong, viable, peaceful country—was not being fulfilled. The situation was deteriorating for a number of reasons, and not just because North Vietnam was helping the Vietcong. Now the United States is trying to win in North Vietnam the war that was gradually being lost in South Vietnam.

Both sides can and do claim that no new policy is involved. Hanoi has been helping the Vietcong for years and the United States has been defending South Vietnam. But there has been a change in degree that is so great that it amounts to a change in policy: The war has been escalated. The United States has taken it from the ground in South Vietnam to the air in North Vietnam, as big a change as the decision of President Kennedy in 1961 to put a sizable number of American military into Vietnam. The newest decision is to step up the war in the belief and hope that Hanoi will be forced into a willingness to negotiate and that China and Russia will hold off.

At this point the dangers in American policy become evident. It is doubtless true, as S. L. A. Marshall argues in the New Leader, that the Chinese are in no position to pour ground troops into Vietnam as they did in Korea. But there are other things China can do; and in any event, Hanoi would not need a Chinese ground army. North Vietnam has a well-trained army of about 300,000 men which is already at hand. The Soviet Union could furnish arms and planes, along with Russian "advisers."

The more the war is escalated, the greater its political effects are bound to be. Granted that politics is an art and not a science, it is still possible to predict that the more pressure the United States exerts on Hanoi and the greater the danger of destruction to North Vietnam, the more likely it becomes that Moscow will be driven closer to Peiping. By the same token, the promising détente between Moscow and Washington will be weakened. If the present American policy of widening the war and refusing to consider negotiations at this time forces Moscow back toward the East, Communist China will be the gainer.

More and more questions torment the mind. Is the United States choosing the best battleground for resisting Communist aggression? Can just a little escalation produce the required results? Can escalation in fact be controlled once it has begun? And how far is this country prepared to pursue the one-way street in which it is letting itself be trapped?

[From the New York Times, Mar. 10, 1965]

A NEGOTIATION IS A NEGOTIATION

The words were hardly out of Secretary General Thant's mouth when the United States rejected his proposal. He had recommended a seven-power conference on the Vietnamese conflict.

The State Department spokesman gave the same old reply. "We still await some indication that the aggressors are prepared to talk about stopping the aggression," he said, adding that Washington would require advance evidence that negotiations would produce an agreement acceptable to the United States in Vietnam. In other words, the United States will negotiate if our terms are accepted before negotiations begin. So why negotiate?

This futile game of diplomatic chess thus remains in stalemate while the war itself escalates. Yet all wars, including the Vietnamese type, must end in some form of parley. The questions are when and how? President Johnson and his chief advisers believe the time is not ripe and that present circumstances find the United States—strong as it is—in an unfavorable position. American policy therefore is to improve the position and then consider negotiation from a vantage point where terms can be extracted to fit American demands.

On both sides the game is being played as if it can be won or lost. In reality, there can be no "victory" except at a shattering cost in lives and treasure.

President Kennedy put the problem accurately in a speech he made on September 2, 1963. "In the final analysis," he said, "it is their (the South Vietnamese) war. They are the ones who have to win it or lose it. We can help them; we can give them equipment; we can send our men out there as advisers, but they have to win it—the people of Vietnam—against the Communists."

President Johnson, on the contrary, has now changed this policy and is trying to win the war with American arms and American forces on behalf of the South Vietnamese. This is impossible, because, as Mr. Kennedy said, "It is their war"—although it is of course also true that the North Vietnamese are supplying increasing help to one side, as the United States is to the other.

March 11, 1965

4750

The conference that Secretary Thant has recommended may or may not be an answer. It certainly deserves a more sympathetic exploration than it is getting from Washington.

There must be many Congressmen who are unhappy but reluctant to say so, and many, if not most, of the American people who would surely opt for negotiation if the issues—all the issues—were made clear to them. The American public has not been sufficiently informed and it cannot be until President Johnson speaks to the Nation.

No one can ask that he tell exactly what he plans to do, or that he divulge military secrets, or say just what terms would be acceptable, but when the President does not speak the people lack leadership. They have become confused while the Vietnamese conflict has become crucial and dangerous.

THE OUTRAGE IN SELMA

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I have today received from one of my constituents a forthright letter on the subject of the brutality and lawlessness perpetrated by so-called law-enforcement officers in two Southern States. This letter expresses the righteous indignation which all decent Americans must feel.

I also have received a telegram expressing similar feelings, from four residents of different States, including Alaska.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. George E. Fowler's letter of March 9, 1965, as well as the telegram from San Francisco, be printed at this point in my remarks in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter and the telegram were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PALMER, ALASKA,
March 9, 1965.

Senator GRUENING,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: I don't want any more of my taxes spent to support the States of Alabama and Mississippi. I don't want my taxes to build highways to beat Negroes on. I don't want my taxes to build schools to keep Negroes out of. I don't want my taxes to build dams, airports, post offices, powerplants, harbors, or anything else in those States until every last Negro can vote freely, without delay, or fear, or reprisal.

Damn it, Senator, I want my Government to stop this sickening treatment of my fellow citizens right now, not tomorrow or a hundred years from now, and I want you to not stop until those poor people have full protection of the police and full protection from the police.

Today I'm ashamed to be a white man. I'm even ashamed to be an American.

Sincerely,

GEORGE "E" FOWLER.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.,
March 9, 1965.

Senator ERNEST GRUENING,
Washington, D.C.:

We hold these truths to be self-evident. That all men are created equal, even in Selma, Ala., U.S.A.

BETSY KINCAID LOONEY, Austin, Tex.;
RICHARD H. ELLIS, Salem, Oreg.; RICHARD CONNOLLY LAFORCE, Downey, Calif.;
FRANCIS M. LOTTSCHELT, Anchorage.

SENATOR BARTLETT'S DEDICATED CAMPAIGN AGAINST AIR POLLUTION BY RADIOACTIVE FALLOUT

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, how pure is the air we breathe? How safe is

the food we eat? Do we really enjoy "the right to breathe the air as nature provided it, the right of future generations to a healthy existence?" as John Kennedy asked in his historical June 10, 1963, address at American University, in Washington, D.C.

These questions must be answered. I am very happy today to pay tribute to my colleague from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT] who—more than any other person in the land—has pressed our government agencies for answers to these questions, which are of such vital concern to mankind.

BOB BARTLETT has spoken on these questions many times. On April 4, 1963, he discussed the "Danger in the Arctic as Radioactivity Mounts." He said:

A grave and potentially dangerous situation exists in the Arctic regions of our Nation. American citizens of Eskimo and Indian stock who live in inland Alaska rely upon caribou meat as their principal food stock. There is reason to believe that the caribou are becoming increasingly contaminated with strontium 90 and cesium 137. This contamination cannot be of good effect, and may well be of harm to these people and to their descendants.

The "dangerous situation" to which Senator BARTLETT referred is of particular concern to Alaskans, especially the Eskimos, many of whom hunt for the meat they eat. The Arctic food chain is simple: It links directly the food of the caribou, the lichen, and the Alaskan Eskimo, who hunts and kills the caribou which provides his principal food. Survival in the Arctic, never easy, should not be complicated or endangered after the caribou has been killed.

But man is endangering his fellowman in an unexpected and potentially injurious way. Atomic fallout from past tests, containing strontium 90 and cesium 137, falls on the lichen-caribou-man food chain in the Arctic regions of Siberia, Canada, Europe, and the United States. The nuclear test ban, unsigned by China and France cannot stop the fallout from atomic bombs already exploded nor can it stop the atomic buccaneers from dropping more.

No one knows the true extent of the fallout; but BOB BARTLETT, to his everlasting credit, and to our everlasting better health, is persisting in his efforts to direct the attention of the Federal Government agencies toward solving the radioactive fallout problem in the Arctic. He is in constant communication with the Division of Radiological Health, of the U.S. Public Health Service, because Eskimos of the Arctic continue to receive several times more strontium 90 and cesium 137 into their systems than do residents of other States. The reason, of course, is that in spite of the test ban treaty, the winds continue to carry the poisons of past tests, sprinkling them across the Arctic. Strontium 90 eventually is absorbed by the bones of the human body, and it is particularly dangerous to children. Concentrated, it can cause leukemia or bone cancer. Cesium 137 spreads throughout the body, and can produce mutations of the gene structure, causing possible deformities in newborn children.

Senator BARTLETT says, and I concur, that any strontium 90 is bad, more is worse, and to deny the fact is foolish. He correctly states:

It is both foolish and inhumane not to investigate with very great care situations involving continued substantial intake of the isotope.

On March 4, BOB BARTLETT called for "an immediate and substantial Federal research program into the problems caused by fallout in the Arctic." He has pledged that as a member of the Appropriations Committee of the U.S. Senate, he will work to see that our radiological health studies receive all the funds and all the assistance they may require.

I share BOB BARTLETT's concern; and I support his unrelenting battle to learn the facts, and to see what more can be done thereafter.

The Public Health Service is unable to supply information as to the total exposure Eskimos have received at Anaktuvuk Pass, in the Brooks Range.

The Public Health Service does not know what will be the effect of continued Chinese testing. China is not a signatory of the test ban treaty.

The Public Health Service suggests that reindeer meat, if uncontaminated, could be substituted for contaminated caribou meat; but Senator BARTLETT has been advised that—

Based on the limited data secured from our expanded surveillance of reindeer herds, our tentative judgment is that this measure would not be effective, because levels in reindeer are comparable to those in caribou.

Available facts, and they are few, indicate that the contamination level in the Arctic will increase. Many biologists share the concern of Senator BARTLETT, as I do.

The fiscal year 1965 budget of the Public Health Service includes \$153,000 for specific use in Alaska, for the radiation surveillance network of air stations, pasteurized milk sampling, the institutional diet network station, expanded caribou and reindeer sampling programs, human bone sampling for strontium 90, and cesium, and additional analyses of native diets.

In addition, the Public Health Service reports that analysis of findings in the Arctic is made at laboratories in Nevada and Washington—for which no financial figures are available.

Such programs are a beginning; but we must go far beyond penny financing if we are to have the knowledge required concerning the levels of contamination man can experience and survive, and to learn what steps can be taken to counteract the exposure to radiation which confronts man and animal.

We have to have the facts. With the leadership of men like Senator BOB BARTLETT, I am confident that we shall get these facts and an adequate Federal program to cope with the problems they present.

In an article appearing in the winter, 1964-65, issue of Indian Truth, there is a discussion of the radioactive-fallout threat in the Arctic. I quote from the article:

March 11, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

4759

designed to win gratitude on the Soviet side. As one of my foreign service colleagues used to say, you can't bank good will in Moscow and I would be the last to advocate anything of that sort.

But what you can do is to hold out to Moscow a plausible prospect of accommodation in those issues that are theoretically susceptible of solution in this way, and avoid the accenting of those that are not. This, as I see it, means serious effort by the West to provide a reasonable basis for accommodation in the great issues of Germany and of nuclear weapons control—in those issues, in other words, that affect primarily the European theater and are central problems of Russia's relationship with the West.

At the same time, an effort must be made to deemphasize wherever possible conflicts that fall under the Communist category of the anticolonialist struggle, conflicts in the face of which Moscow, when its hand is forced, is bound to come down formally on the anti-American, if not the pro-Chinese, side.

It does not appear to me that American policy of recent years stacks up very well in relation to this requirement. I have not seen the evidence that we have done all we could do to find agreement with the Soviet Union in matters of Germany and disarmament.

Needless irritations, such as the "captive nations resolution" and various antiquated trade restrictions, are still permitted to impede the development of Soviet-American relations. And our present involvement in Vietnam is a classic example of the sort of situation we ought to avoid if we do not wish to provoke in Moscow precisely those reactions that are most adverse to our interests.

It is largely as a consequence of these strategic errors that we find ourselves in the dangerous and unpromising position we occupy today.

I can think of nothing the West needs more, at this stage, than a readiness to relax: not to worry so much about these remote countries scattered across the southern crescent, to let them go their own way, not to regard their fate as its exclusive responsibility, to wait for them to come look to the West rather than fussing continually over them. The more we exert ourselves to protect them from communism, the less the exertion they are going to undertake themselves.

The West is not, after all, their keeper. They have in general much more to demand than they have to give. And others, even the Communists, are not likely to derive much more profit than the United States or former mother-countries have derived in the past from the effort to keep them.

THE SITUATION IN VIETNAM

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I shall lecture at Harvard University tomorrow on the Vietnam problem. I should like to say certain things in the Senate before I say them at Harvard. I shall cover in some greater depth some of the points of view that I express in this short speech now in the Senate.

The entry of the United States into the war in southeast Asia is a process that has steadily grown over the last 10 years and will steadily grow at an accelerated pace in the next 10 years. The committing of 3,500 Marines to ground combat is only the first installment of U.S. ground forces that will be needed in the former French colony of Indochina, for the more that war becomes an American war, the more combat troops we will have to put in.

The pretense that we were aiding the people of South Vietnam—and it has been a pretense for several years—has now been dropped. From now on, the war will be conducted by Americans, for American objectives, and under American command. It is obvious that no internal political forces within South Vietnam will be allowed to reach positions of power except with American approval. And it will be the strategic interests of the United States, as we see them, that will determine the course of the war.

From the official silence as to our objectives, and the President's rebukes to those who continue to debate the matter in public, it is also obvious to me that the administration is entirely uncertain as to the outcome. Surely any nation that is firm in its knowledge of where it is going and how it is going to get there would welcome, rather than squelch, public debate and discussion.

But having greatly escalated the American war effort, the administration is now dependent upon the wisdom and even the good faith of North Vietnam and even Red China not to escalate in turn, and to seek peace on our terms instead of elevating and prolonging the war as we chose to do.

Mr. President, the number of American boys who will die in Asia in the next 10 to 25 years will depend upon the decisions of North Vietnam and China to respond to American aggressive action in Asia. If they respond, and if China moves on the ground, we shall send over hundreds of thousands of Americans, and thousands and thousands of them will come back in coffins.

I think the whole thing is unnecessary.

After the holocaust, no matter how many years of war we will wage—and it will be a long and lengthy one—we shall have to settle down to the long, hard pull of rehabilitation, with all the cost in material and money and additional blood, for as long as we stay there, and for how many decades it may be that we will be the victims.

I am at a loss to understand how so many people can be so shortsighted as not to recognize that fact. I say respectfully I believe it is because so few are thinking about America 25, 35, 50, and 100 years hence. These are the great critical hours, and also the hours of great opportunity for promoting peace, for our leadership to be thinking about the United States and Asia and the rest of the world, 25, 35, 50, and 100 years hence. It is unanswerably true that one does not win peace by war. In fact, no longer can a war produce peace. All that this war will produce will be growing problems and crises that will have to be solved eventually pretty much on the same basis on which they could be solved right now without a further extension of the war.

So in spite of some of the criticisms I am receiving from certain superpatriots I will continue to plead for reason and resort to the available procedures of international law for the settlement of this dispute.

One of the most inexcusable fallacies of the Johnson administration is its

constant reference to the statement, "We will not negotiate until North Vietnam leaves South Vietnam alone." In other words, we will not negotiate except on our terms, and we are a little bit amiss when we find that North Vietnam and others take a similar closed-mind position.

Mr. President, I do not know why the other free nations of the world, our allies, take the attitude which they do. I am at a loss to understand why the Prime Minister of Great Britain, Mr. Wilson, thinks it is a problem that can be postponed for a conference in Washington a month hence. The growing flames of war are devouring great values of peace in Asia. I was glad that the Prime Minister of Canada, speaking in New York City the other night, suggested in effect that there ought to be an attempt to negotiate an honorable settlement. But may I say to him, "Speech will not do it. Where is Canada officially as a member of the United Nations in keeping with its signature on the United Nations Charter? Why is not Canada calling upon the members of the United Nations to proceed under the provisions of that charter to take jurisdiction over this threat to world peace? Where is the Prime Minister of Great Britain? Why is he not, in behalf of his Government, calling for the application of the rules of law which he, as the representative of his Government, is obligated to carry out by way of Great Britain's signature to the United Nations Charter?" Thus I can go down the line of our allies and ask, "Why the delay?"

Inconceivable as I hope it would be, could it be that our alleged allies do not desire to offend the greatest power on the face of the earth which at this hour is the greatest threat to the peace of the world—the United States of America?

That is an ugly thought. Yet sometimes I toss at night under the fear that it might very well be true. I toss also with sadness to think that my country, which has prated so much about resorting to the peaceful procedures of international law for the settlement of disputes that threaten the peace of the world, has so completely walked out on its ideals in the field of foreign policy today vis-a-vis the United States war-making aggressive policies in southeast Asia. We have abdicated our temple of ideals, and we have gone into the jungles of warmaking.

What I say about my country is true also of North Vietnam, Red China, South Vietnam, and the Pathet Lao in Laos. But that does not excuse us. To the contrary, it makes it all the more imperative that we ought to have exercised the leadership months ago—yes, years ago—in seeking a United Nations settlement of this threat to peace. Twenty years ago Franklin Roosevelt said it when he proposed an international trusteeship for all of Indochina. We walked out on that ideal. Mr. President, would that the present Presiding Officer and I could come back 50 years from today and read the chapters of history dealing with this violation of international law by the United States and others.

March 11, 1965

4760

As I have said so many times during the past year in speeches in opposition to American aggressive action in South Vietnam, no addition of wrongs on the other side of the ledger makes a wrong on our side right. To the contrary, those wrongs on the other side of the ledger make it all the more our duty to insist that the procedures of international law be applied to the war in Asia rather than the dropping of American bombs. We are in a position where the answer to the question about how many American boys will die in the war in the years ahead in Asia will be determined by whether or not North Vietnam and Red China move on the ground. If they move on the ground, tens upon tens of thousands of American boys will die—and it is not necessary or justifiable.

I know all the arguments that the warhawks have been giving us, including that fallacious paper known as the white paper.

The American people are being asked to swallow the propaganda that if we do not make war, all of Asia will fall to the Red Chinese. Tell it to our alleged allies in Asia.

Only this morning I read a new phraseology for the old argument that if we do not do what we are doing, we shall have to fall back to San Francisco and Alaska. The proponents are even giving up Hawaii in their most recent argument. This statement is an insult to the intelligence of anyone of normal intelligence. Mr. President, South Vietnam does not happen to be in the perimeter of American defense. If we got into a war with Red Asia tomorrow, the United States would not keep an American boy over there any longer than it would take to get him out. I paraphrase, but I believe accurately, the statement of the distinguished present occupant of the chair, the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. McGovern]. As he said so eloquently and brilliantly the other night on the CBS debate on the South Vietnam problem, "The domino theory has no basis in fact or in reality."

I have a little difficulty with the white paper, because the top spokesman of the Department of State in this country repudiated the domino theory before the Committee on Foreign Relations within recent weeks. I say now to Dean Rusk: Deny it in public. The State Department recognizes the fallacy of the domino theory. Yet, much of the argument of the administration is but a restatement of the domino theory.

No; that war will not be stopped by the killing of thousands, perhaps millions, of Asians. That war will not be stopped by the sacrificing of thousands of American boys. The only hope of stopping that war is to have the United States return to its position of leadership in the world, in support of our own ideals, a position which we have abdicated. It happens that those ideals are also unanswerable practicalities. There is nothing practical in this day and age about making war; but there is something very practical about keeping faith with one's morals; there is something very practical about keeping faith with one's ideals; there is something very

practical about seeking to implement the procedures of international law. Those are the practicalities that can lead us to peace. The impracticality and expedience of killing will lead us to eventual destruction, and the rest of mankind with us, if we follow that course of action.

As one who supports the President in so many policies—in probably 95 percent of them—I speak with a heavy heart when I say that I repudiate his foreign policy in Asia, because his foreign policy in Asia, history will prove, could not possibly be in the interest either of the United States or of the peace of the world.

Our announced objective, we say—or our State Department through the Secretary of State says—is "to make Red China leave her neighbors alone." But we are not dealing with China either militarily or diplomatically at the present time to achieve that aim, and we are not even claiming that Red China is involved in the South Vietnam war—not yet. So far, we are saying that it is North Vietnam that is aiding the Vietcong rebels in the South. So our actions would indicate that it is North Vietnam and not Red China that we want to have leave its neighbors alone.

We have now broadened the war from South Vietnam, where we were losing a civil war, to include North Vietnam. It appears to be our theory that the application of overwhelming U.S. airpower will induce North Vietnam to cease aiding the rebels in the South, although there is no reason to believe that even if she did, South Vietnam could have a stable, pro-Western government. The turmoil in South Vietnam and the successes of the rebels have not been due to aid from outside, and the testimony of administration officials was given to that effect right up to the moment when we decided to expand the war to North Vietnam.

The course the administration has embarked on requires North Vietnam to stop aiding the rebels, it requires the Vietcong rebellion to collapse as a result, and it requires stability to emerge in South Vietnam, all as a result of U.S. air attacks on North Vietnam. The likelihood that any of these things will result is so remote that it is no wonder the administration is anxious to quell discussion of it.

I do not question the good faith of the President in embarking on this policy with the idea that it will end the war in South Vietnam to our advantage. But I am also satisfied that there are many in the high offices of the Pentagon and the State Department who know perfectly well that the only result of such a policy will be the steady expansion of the war throughout all of the old French colony of Indochina, the steady increase in the use of American air and naval power, and the steady funneling of more and more American troops into southeast Asia. They owe it to the President to tell him so, for they have the facts; he does not. But he is entitled to receive them.

The desire to establish an American military bastion on the borders of China

has long been characteristic of many of these officials, who believe the presence of half a million U.S. troops in Western Europe should be matched with half a million troops in southeast Asia, to form a "trip wire" that would bring full American nuclear power to bear on China should she make any move to support the local governments.

I have long believed our entanglement in Asia would be disastrous for the United States. Certainly it has been proved that helping local governments help themselves in the way recommended by General Taylor and his predecessors in Saigon is a failure. We have not helped them at all; the position of Saigon has only been steadily weakened by the so-called aid they have received from us in the last 10 years. The next step in retrieving the situation must be the takeover of the country by the United States and the full military activity of U.S. troops, both of which are underway today in South Vietnam.

How much further this entanglement goes will depend almost entirely upon the reaction of other nations. Ten years ago, it was the refusal of Britain to participate in the Indochina war that kept the United States out. But 10 years ago, there were other trouble spots, especially in Europe, that also restrained us from getting into a singlehanded war in Asia. Today, tensions are sufficiently relaxed with the Soviet Union to encourage many of our policymakers to believe that we are free to fight in Asia without worrying too much about outbreaks elsewhere.

But we cannot count on Russia abandoning North Vietnam or even China. I am aghast when I hear witnesses for the administration express the view that they believe Russia's controversy with Red China is so deep that there is little or no danger of her involving herself in South Vietnam.

Even if true, that would not justify our shocking, aggressive course of action in Asia. If true, that would not justify our walking out on our ideals based upon past commitments to international law as the way to work for peace. But I happen to be of the point of view that if we follow a course of action that will lead to bombing in Red China, extended bombing further up in North Vietnam, and the killing of increasing numbers of civilians—and it cannot be avoided—there is a great danger that if Russia is going to hold any position of influence in the Communist segment of the world, she will have no choice but to come to their aid. And if Russia moves in, she is not likely to move in on the installment plan.

It is a risk that we should not run. It is a risk that threatens all of humanity. And it is such a risk that the leaders of other nations who profess to want peace have an obligation to the world to tarry no longer. They have an obligation to bring the United States and the nations with whom we are fighting in Asia to the council tables of the world, to listen to their proposals for peace, and then to make suggestions to the other nations as to what they think are fair proposals for the settlement of the war.

How Britain, France, the Soviet Union, Japan, India, and other major nations of the area react to the widening war in Indochina will decide our future there, because it is clear the administration does not intend to have it discussed among the American people if it can help it. It prefers not to mention any real objective or to analyze its chances of reaching it with present tactics. The public, we in Congress, and I am sure even President Johnson, do not know how escalating the war to North Vietnam will win it in South Vietnam. We do not even know if that is our real purpose. Sad to say, the American people are in the hands of unfolding events and the actions of other nations, rather than logic, reason, and adherence to our past principles of the rule of law in world affairs which seem to be vacated by most of the leaders of our country at the present moment.

Mr. President, I speak with some humility before the Presiding Officer of the Senate, after listening to him on the CBS radio debate the other night. I am proud to associate myself with his argument. I am proud to join the Senator in his plea for making use of existing international procedures to try to work out a peaceful settlement of this war in Asia. I hope that the people of this country—for they, and they alone, can stop this war now—will take time out from their economic lives to devote some time to their political responsibility.

If the war is to be stopped, if American policy in Asia is going to be changed, the American people alone can change it.

We who are speaking out on the subject know full well some of its consequences. I heed not those consequences so far as my individual interests are concerned. But I do give great heed to what I think are my responsibilities to plead for peace with honor through the channels of the international agencies and procedures so long as there is any hope of ending this conflict. So far as I am concerned, that hope will continue in my breast until our Government declares war.

I was not a party in supporting advice to the President to permit him to make war unconstitutionally—and he is making war unconstitutionally in Asia. He has not the slightest legal right under the Constitution of the United States to be bombing North Vietnam, short of a declaration of war.

So, until Congress carries out its legal obligations, if it wants to declare war, this voice will be raised in support of an honorable attempt at an honorable, negotiated settlement of that war in Asia in which the United States, by its aggressive course of action for a long time past, stands, in my judgment, convicted before the bar of world opinion as the greatest threat to the peace of the world.

ADDRESS BY SENATOR McNAMARA ON ANTIPOVERTY WAR

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, on March 10, the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA] delivered an address on the antipoverty war before the National Committee for Community Development.

The Senator from Michigan, who was sponsor of the legislation creating the Office of Economic Opportunity and who managed its passage in the Senate, made some thoughtful comments on how this program must be implemented if it is to be successful.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of his remarks be printed in the body of the Record.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

ADDRESS BY SENATOR PAT McNAMARA, DEMOCRAT, OF MICHIGAN, BEFORE THE NATIONAL COMMITTEE FOR COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT, WASHINGTON, D.C., MARCH 10, 1965

I was pleased to receive Mayor Jerry Cavanaugh's invitation to address this new organization, which is to concern itself with the community action program.

An association of community officials assigned to the antipoverty war has great potential.

The field into which we have entered, with the enactment of this legislation, is complex. It is also challenging in finding new ways to solve old problems.

In that sense, you will be able to serve each other through establishing lines of communication and exchanging experiences and ideas.

You also should be able to help the Federal agencies handling these programs by giving them the benefit of your firsthand application of the weapons the administration and Congress have provided.

Needless to say, we in Congress are very interested in following the progress of this law.

Quite a few of the taxpayers' dollars are involved here, and we have a responsibility to those who pay them—and to those who are to benefit.

The Federal Government has been described as a large body of money surrounded by people who want some of it.

I don't consider that this is necessarily bad, and I probably have been as active as any in proposing—and voting for—programs which distribute those dollars.

I happen to subscribe to the theory that a major role of our Government is to help us become a stronger and more prosperous Nation, and not to show a profit.

Surprising as it may seem, we still have a considerable body of public thought that tends toward what we might call domestic isolationism.

These are the people who gain a false sense of security from their State boundaries, as if the happenings elsewhere cannot reach them. Or they may feel that participating in Federal-State programs somehow taints them.

I recall that during the depression of the 1930's, those running the city of Detroit felt that it was beneath Detroit's dignity to accept public works funds that were part of the national recovery program.

I might say that most modern mayors, such as Jerry Cavanaugh, are not encumbered by such false pride.

They share the philosophy that we must work as partners in these efforts to help improve the lot of our citizens and their surroundings.

In short, we should no longer waste our time in futile discussions of States rights and Federal rights but instead, think in terms of people's rights.

That, of course, was what we intended in enacting legislation to battle against poverty. But it is important that we do not permit this war on poverty to get out of perspective.

For example, speed in implementing these new programs is important, but it should not become the overriding goal.

We must not forget that the problems which create poverty did not come into existence overnight, nor are they going to be eliminated overnight.

Let me cite just a few of the basic problems that emerge as especially vulnerable to local action.

MASSIVE REDUCTION OF ILLITERACY

New techniques must be developed to address the problems of functional illiteracy among youth and adults.

The national waste of talent and energy due to the inability to read, write, and communicate must be eliminated.

MATERNAL AND CHILD HEALTH

The tragic differential in infant mortality rates among the poor in urban and rural areas and the more advantaged groups in our country is a national disgrace, and must be eliminated.

We have the knowledge and the technology to do this now.

THE TRANSITIONAL PERIOD FROM YOUTH TO ADULTHOOD

This critical period in the life of a youth whose family is poor can spell the difference of a life of poverty or a life as an effective contributing citizen.

We need to develop a wide array of programs that allow every youth to achieve his maximum potential.

We must organize our secondary schools, our employment services, our colleges and universities, our community agencies so that there is readily available the appropriate training, education, and placement for everyone who, upon entering adulthood, needs guidance, direction, and encouragement.

Anything less saps this Nation of valuable resources.

THE FLIGHT OF THE AGED

The elderly citizens of our Nation have many problems facing them. But for those who also are the poverty stricken, these problems are magnified.

Our statistics show that more than 12 million have incomes of less than \$2,000 a year. And the fact that 70 percent of our elderly are concentrated in urban areas make them an especially important area for concern and action by community action programs.

I don't need to tell you that these problems, while simply stated, are not easily solved.

Perhaps the most misleading facet of the phrase "war on poverty" is that it conjures up visions of a gallant, all-or-nothing charge against the enemy.

While producing certain inspiration, this vision is not at all accurate.

This is just the beginning of the war—a war that promises to be a long one. It also will be a costly one, although the cost will be but a fraction of the bill that poverty levies against society.

We won't see quick results, but what we can do is to build a strong foundation and arm ourselves with sound ideas and programs to launch our attacks.

We must never lose sight of the main objective, which is to reduce and destroy the conditions that produce and breed poverty.

This is why you must see to it that your community action programs are not permitted to become the means for local empire building or just the source of well-paying staff jobs.

Already, as I am sure you have detected, there is some disenchantment with the methods being used in establishing some community action programs.

There is the complaint that, in some areas, the very people who supposedly will benefit have no voice in the planning of the programs.

You must not, of course, permit this to happen.

March 11, 1965

4762

You cannot put yourselves in a position where you impose good works on the poverty stricken. Such an approach is doomed to failure.

The effective implementation of the community action program will be based, in large measure, on the willingness of local communities to expand the base of decision-making for programs affecting the poor.

Education, health, welfare, and manpower programs can no longer be developed solely by the social and economic elite and the professionals on behalf of the poor.

Local community action agencies must be prepared to experiment with the broadest possible extension of such participation.

However, I think it is a healthy sign, really, that such comments are breaking into the open so early. I sincerely hope that future criticism rings out loud and clear in areas where such criticism is justified.

It is only in this way that we can prevent the dynamic and imaginative concepts that created these programs from being smothered by petty bureaucracy and from becoming a plaything of the professionals. We cannot afford that. We cannot afford that in dollars.

But most importantly, we cannot afford that because of the human lives that are involved here, and because of the hope that we have raised with our brave talk of warring against poverty.

The community action program is the key-stone upon which success will be built.

We will expect communities to coordinate existing separate programs, and through them to try new approaches to old problems.

This will not be easy in many cases. It is frequently difficult to break old rivalries, as well as long-established patterns and concepts of how to deal with these problems. But it must be done.

Actually, the only limit on what can be accomplished in this war on poverty is the ingenuity of the local leadership.

And by showing us in Congress that this ingenuity is virtually unlimited and effective, you will make it that much easier for us to provide the additional weapons needed in the struggle for human dignity and a stronger Nation.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I will ask the Senator to close his ears for a moment while I make this supplemental statement about his speech.

The war on poverty which was encompassed legislatively in the bill that the Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA] so skillfully guided through this body is being attacked in some places on a partisan basis.

I say to the party of the opposition, or those within the party of the opposition who seek to make political capital out of the suffering of many thousands of poverty stricken Americans, that they are going to discover that the intelligence of the American voter will not be fooled by that brand of partisanship. I commend the Senator from Michigan for his brilliant and eloquent speech.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, I express my appreciation to the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. Morse] for his very generous remarks, and assure him that I appreciate them very much.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I understand that another Senator wishes to come to the floor. Therefore I will forego having the Senate adjourn, as the

majority leader asked me to do when I completed my talk.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

DEFENSIVE ARMS FOR ISRAEL

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, in a world not blessed with disarmament, countries strive to maintain a balance of defensive strength. When the pendulum of power is threatened with imbalance, as it is now so seriously threatened in the Middle East, I urge the United States to rally its greatest efforts to check the swing toward bloodshed and destruction.

The buildup of Communist military aid to the United Arab Republic, the abrogation of West Germany's agreement to ship to Israel the remaining third of an estimated \$90 million of vital defensive arms, and the current work in Syria and Jordan for diversion of Israel's water sources by its Arab neighbors are three real and present dangers to peace and stability in the Middle East.

Tanks, planes, submarines, patrol boats, rockets, and other modern weapons furnished by the Soviet Union to dictator Nasser's United Arab Republic dot Israel's western border. There is evidence, from recent hostilities on Israel's northern border, of Soviet military advisers' actually serving with Syria's armed services.

Syria has increased the number of her destructive raids on Israel's northern border; and the Syrian Government uses the threat of so-called Israeli "aggression" to sow terror among an already inflamed population.

Arab commando raids on Israeli territory are more frequent than they have been for years, and gunfire exchanges have increased on the Arab-Israeli borders. Moreover, for the first time in nearly a decade, Arab commandos are "firing up" civilians by carrying out terror raids, such as the bombing of a farmer's house and silo at Kfar Hess, on February 28.

There are two threats which add new terror to the raids on Israel's borders: One threat is the Palestine Liberation Organization, recruited among the Arab refugees remaining in the United Nations camps on Israel's borders and from the Arab States. The second threat is the United Arab command, organized in January 1964, as a direct weapon against Israel. It is to be financed, over a period of 10 years, with over \$420 million, to be contributed by Arab countries.

The preservation of peace in the Middle East is further threatened by the current work by the Arab States to cut off the flow of all the rivers which run from Arab territory into Israeli territory. Premier Levi Eshkol has called the Jordan River waters as "precious as the blood in our veins," and has warned that

peace in the Middle East depends on whether the Arab States carry out their plans to choke off Israel's just share of water.

Israel desperately needs more defense arms, in order to protect herself against the increasing threats and pressures of the Arab States. Dictator Nasser, by threatening to recognize East Germany, forced the Federal Republic of West Germany into canceling its arms contracts with Israel. Approximately \$37 million of the agreed \$90 million of vital defensive arms will not be shipped to the Israeli people at a time when the defense of their country against the Arab States is so urgently needed.

Although in 1962 we loaned Israel the money with which to buy short-range Hawk missiles, to counterbalance Egypt's ground-to-air missiles and supersonic bombers, the United States has not otherwise provided Israel with military equipment. The United States however, does provide arms for several Arab States.

Since the present imbalance in the Middle East not only threatens the state of Israel, but also is a threat to peace itself in that important part of the world, I make the following proposals:

First. The United States should allow Israel to purchase additional defensive weapons for air defense.

Second. Since Israel has no effective counter to Egypt's fleet of fast patrol boats carrying ship-to-shore missiles—which are capable of doing severe damage to Israel's coastal cities—I urge that the United States supply Israel with the needed arms with which to defend itself against these missile-laden boats.

Third. The United States should declare that it views as a threat to peace the present Arab "spite" plan to cut off Israel's water supply.

Dictator Nasser has proven by his actions that his intentions toward conquest go beyond the borders of Israel. He continues to back the Congolese rebels, and otherwise upset central African conditions. He is presently escalating his war against the loyalist forces in Yemen, where Egyptian troops now total 50,000, more than double what they were until recently.

I urge that the United States rally the people of the free world to be courageous to do what is morally called for, which clearly is to move now with action to preserve the peace and balance of power in the Middle East.

VOTER REGISTRATION LEGISLATION URGED

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, the role of the United States as leader of the free world could be lost in the streets of Selma, Ala.

How can a nation hold its head high as freedom's leader among the peoples of southeast Asia when it allows its citizens to be beaten, gassed, and flogged in its streets because they want to vote, and when a minister of the gospel is beaten almost to death.

How can we plead the justice of freedom's cause when the oppressive police

whether it is desirable to take these jobs away from our loyal postal clerks by forcing private mailers to perform the mail sorting function. I would be hopeful that the postal unions will let us have their views on this subject.

If it is inevitable that the American postal system is to become computerized, we must be extremely cautious that automation will not outlaw the human factor. There is no substitute for the loyal postman. More often than not, he is the closest link citizens have with their Government. He should not be replaced by a machine.

I am hopeful that the Postmaster General will withdraw the regulation which would require the sacking of certain bulk second- and third-class mail by ZIP code sectional centers beginning July 1 of this year. Merchants and business firms which use the mails to conduct their affairs simply are not ready for this complex requirement. Mr. Gronouski should withhold all orders of this kind until Congress has had a chance to gather and weigh evidence.

Snuffboxes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. GEORGE D. AIKEN

OF VERMONT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 11, 1965

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, since snuffboxes and the quality of the snuff, as it used to be found in the Senate, has been the subject of some discussion in and out of the press, and since our old friend and former colleague, Ralph Flanders, was the Senate's foremost expert on snuffboxes and the quality of the snuff, in order to try to clear up the situation—although probably it never can be cleared up satisfactorily to everyone—I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record a column which appears in News and Notes, a publication of the Vermont Historical Society, issue of March 1965, the title of which is "Not up to Snuff."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

NOT UP TO SNUFF

As reported in a recent Washington newspaper the furnishings of the U.S. Senate Chamber includes two snuffboxes. It appears that the last user thereof was none other than our former Senator, Ralph E. Flanders. That gentleman, after 7 years' absence, returned to the Senate, not to view any legislation but to check on the snuffboxes. He was mortified to find that the snuff was not fresh but dry and old. Feeling that the Senate Members had drifted away from more elegant habits, he stomped out declaring, "Tradition is tradition."

This note was contributed by tongue-in-cheek Charles Morrissey of the J. F. Kennedy Library. The above is substantially the version by Mr. George Dixon in the Washington Post. Below is the episode as recounted by Senator Flanders in a letter to Mr. Dixon:

"DEAR FRIEND DIXON: I was much amused by your reference to the snuffboxes and myself in your Saturday column. It seems to

me that you ought to know a little more of the history of this subject which until now has been kept a secret from the west side of the aisle of the Senate Chamber.

"After I had been in the Senate long enough to feel at home, the thought occurred to me that all new Republican Senators should be ceremonially indoctrinated with the principles of the Founding Fathers. What better ceremony could be devised than that of taking snuff as they did so habitually? With this thought in mind I tied each new arriving Republican Senator to the snuffbox and with him took a ceremonial pinch of the nose-tickling stuff, at the same time ceremonially impressing on him the duty of following the principles of those for whom the stuff was originally provided.

"Indoctrination was successful in every case except one. Senator GORDON ALLOTT, of Colorado, refused to sneeze. No matter how much snuff he sniffed he either would not or could not sneeze. Just what this means doctrinally I have never been able to find out. Physically it is unique.

"When I left I draped the shoulders of Senator Keating with the mantle of freshman Republican indoctrination but learned to my sorrow that he had not at all times and with all candidates fulfilled his responsibilities. He, alas, no longer is to be seen on the Senate floor except as a privileged ex-Senator like myself.

"This is the full story of the senatorial snuffboxes so far as I am concerned, though you are right in saying that I insisted on the material being kept fresh and snuffable.

"Sincerely yours,

"RALPH E. FLANDERS."

Why Are We in Southeast Asia?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 11, 1965

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, I have just received an editorial from Mr. Harry F. Guggenheim, president and publisher of Newsday, one of the Nation's leading dailies, which I should like to call to the attention of this august body. Newsday's position is in consonance with mine and I am happy to see the leadership they have displayed in bringing our aims in southeast Asia to the attention of the people of Long Island.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial:

WHY ARE WE IN SOUTHEAST ASIA?

Recently a highly respected and patriotic Senator, ERNEST GRUENING, Democrat, of Alaska, said: "All of southeast Asia is not worth the life of one American boy." The life of an American boy is precious; so is the life of any boy the world over.

From the beginning of time animals, including humans, have destroyed each other. The futility of such destruction is apparent, especially to such enlightened human beings as Senator GRUENING. He, however, qualifies his position by implying that there may be places where Americans should fight—but not in southeast Asia. There are some who believe that life is so precious that it must never be subjected to loss in battle. Others believe that there is one cause worth fighting for, and that is to preserve existence as freemen. Most Americans are willing and ready to fight for their freedom.

Are we fighting for freedom in Vietnam?

The world today is half slave under the tyranny of dominating war lords preaching communism. It is free only in the democracies of free enterprise. The material and spiritual wealth of the world lies outside communism's domain.

The dictators who dominate the lands of communism exhort and drive their people to plunder the free world. They want to communize the entire world—"a demand by the sick that the healthy be cured." Khrushchev once said: "We shall bury you." China's Mao holds: "There is no such thing as peaceful coexistence."

Assuming that Communist world leaders would destroy us if they could, how does that justify our fighting in Vietnam 8,000 miles from our homeland?

To preserve our continental United States we need allies and strong military bases for our survival. We have protection for our Atlantic coast washed by a great ocean whose waters join us with our allies in the free world. Our Pacific coast is washed by waters joined to our enemies of the Communist world. In these waters we have strong advance island bases and allies for the protection of the Pacific frontier. Australia, New Zealand, the Philippines, Japan, and Nationalist China are at our side. Their goodwill and their lands are available for our common defenses.

The Future of Lumber

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MAURINE B. NEUBERGER

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 11, 1965

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, problems facing the west coast lumber industry were analyzed in an article published in the monthly review of the Federal Reserve Bank of San Francisco. Although our domestic lumber industry is faced with severe competitive pressures, the Federal Reserve bank analysis does not discount its future prospects for growth and expansion. The article emphasizes that efficient elements in the western lumber industry promise to maintain a healthy position, through better utilization and increased processing of timber.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

LUMBER: OUT ON A LIMB?

The West long has been the dominant lumber-producing region in the Nation. Nowhere in the world is there concentrated on such a relatively small area of forest land such a rich reservoir of old-growth timber. Yet, despite its wealth in raw material and its strong production record, the western lumber industry has faced a number of severe challenges over the last decade. Beset by strong and growing competition from other producers (foreign and domestic) and from other building materials (wood and nonwood), the industry has seen prices fall, employment decline, and hundreds of small mills go out of business. But current efforts to improve lumber's position—along with the trend toward greater integration with the pulp and paper and plywood industries—offer hope that the western forest products complex will yet reach new heights of production.

and profit. (The lumber industry, the sector emphasized in the following discussion, is composed of those firms engaged in converting logs into rough and finished lumber.)

FROM MAINE TO PUGET SOUND

The birth of the western lumber industry came on the heels of the eastern industry's decline. Lumbering grew up with the country, naturally reaching its first peak of activity in the populous colonies along the Atlantic coast (particularly Maine) and then spreading inward as settlements moved back from the coastline. By 1870, the Lake States (with Michigan in the forefront) replaced the Northeast as the leading producing region.

Yet, by the turn of the century, Great Lakes lumbermen had almost depleted the stands in that region and had begun searching for new forest reserves. The Southern States constituted the next obvious target for development, but lumbermen also began to turn toward the vast frontiers of virgin timber in the Pacific Northwest. Of course, they had heard about big stands of timber that would cut 300,000 feet to the tree, but they had set them aside as bunkhouse myths. But one look was sufficient to dispel the myths, and soon the lumbering families whose names had become famous in Maine and in the Saginaw and on the upper Mississippi were establishing saw and planing mills on Puget Sound, in Grays Harbor, and along the Columbia River.

The Census of 1910 impressively demonstrated the rising importance of both the South and the West. But while the South's relative position has since declined, the West has achieved a position of dominance. Twelfth District States, which accounted for 17 percent of a record national production of 45 billion board feet in 1910, raised their share to 55 percent of total production of 83 billion board feet in 1962. (The western industry is a softwoods industry; in fact, district States accounted for over 68 percent of the Nation's softwoods production in 1962.)

The relative positions of the major producing States shifted after the region's rise to prominence. In 1938, Oregon moved ahead of Washington to become the Nation's leading producer; today, it accounts for nearly one-fourth of the industry's total output. California surpassed Washington during the 1940's to become the second highest producer, and it presently accounts for about 15 percent of national production. Washington's output has declined drastically over the past quarter-century, so that it now supplies only 11 percent of the national total. Idaho, meanwhile, has moved steadily up to fourth position, with about 5 percent of the total.

TIMBER AND MORE TIMBER

The district's dominant position, not only as a producer of lumber but as a producer of other forest products as well, is based on its great reservoir of virgin timber. Although the region embraces only 17 percent, or some 87,250 acres, of total U.S. commercial forest land, it holds 55 percent of the Nation's total footage of sawtimber. The heaviest part of this stand is located in Oregon and Washington, which in themselves contain 85 percent of the Nation's sawtimber—primarily in the Douglas-fir region west of the Cascade Mountains and the ponderosa pine region east of the Cascades.

This heavy density of sawtimber is attributable to the concentration of old-growth timber in district States. The mammoth size of western trees, in turn, helps the regional industry utilize larger sawmills and more modern equipment than are in operation elsewhere. In 1962, about 72 percent of western production was supplied by 373 mills, each producing 15 million board feet or more. In the East, a similar percentage of output was supplied by 30,300 mills, each

producing less than 5 million board feet annually.

On the other hand, a substantial part of the district's sawtimber is not immediately available for conversion into forest products because of forest management policies. Almost 60 percent of the forest area is owned and managed by the Federal Government, about 5 percent by State and local jurisdictions, and most of the remainder by commercial forest interests. Much of the publicly owned timberland is operated on a sustained-yield basis, in which the annual allowable harvest and sale of timber is limited to an amount roughly equivalent to the annual growth. Thus, a more or less even flow of timber is available for marketing from public lands each year.

PROBLEMS IN BUNYAN LAND

On the basis of that resource foundation, western lumbermen have amassed a substantial record of growth, but their record nonetheless has masked a number of problems that have arisen in the last decade. During the first 50 years of its history, the district lumber industry registered tremendous gains in production—gains which contrasted markedly with the one-fifth decline in national production during that period. But district production later began to taper off; in fact, despite the record level achieved in 1959, annual district output in the last half decade has failed to exceed the 18 billion board feet average recorded in the preceding 5-year period. This performance, and declining output elsewhere, depressed national output by 10 percent over the decade, to 34 billion board feet in 1963. (Lumber output and consumption both increased in 1964, but still remained below most earlier postwar peaks.)

This disappointing production record has reflected postwar developments in the residential construction field. Housing, after all, normally accounts for 40 percent of lumber consumption, while other construction accounts for almost as great a share of the total.

As construction rose in the early postwar period to meet the pent-up housing demand, the number of nonfarm starts rose to 1.4 million in 1950—50 percent above the peak rate attained in the 1920's—and lumber consumption rose correspondingly. But in 1963, when housing starts rose to a new peak of 1.6 million, lumber consumption remained below all its earlier postwar peaks.

Part of the explanation for this sluggishness lies in the changing character of the housing market. In particular, the quantity of lumber consumed at a given level of construction has been declining because of the increasing importance of multifamily dwelling units—which utilize only about one-third as much lumber per unit as single-family dwellings—and because of the increasing use of substitute materials for lumber. To aggravate the situation, the decline in consumption of domestically produced lumber has been even more severe than the decline in total consumption because of the rising portion of the market supplied by foreign (mostly Canadian) producers. Over the last dozen years, imports have risen steadily from 5 to 16 percent of the market, and consumption of domestic lumber in 1963 consequently was 14 percent below the 1950 level and 10 percent less than in 1959. Prices meanwhile have reflected these downward pressures; in 1963, the wholesale price index for lumber stood 3 percent below its 1951 level and 6 percent below the 1959 figure.

NEW HOUSING, NEW MATERIALS

The extensive displacement of lumber by substitute materials undoubtedly has become a crucial problem. Plywood, hardboard, particleboard, insulation board, and certain paperboards—along with nonwood products such as metals, plastics, and brick—compete with softwood in many of its important uses.

The contrast between the trend in lumber production and the trend in these other sheet materials dramatically illustrates the changing product mix. While lumber production declined 9 percent between 1950 and 1963, softwood plywood shot up by an explosive 272 percent, hardboard by 157 percent, and insulating board by 23 percent.

Lumber has declined in the forest products mix despite an improvement in its price position relative to all of its major competitors except plywood. Substantial production increases and consequent downward price pressures have been evident in the plywood industry—and have contributed to plywood's inroads into lumber's traditional markets. This price situation, however, has been unique. Prices of construction materials generally have moved upward; such competing materials as structural steel, brick, Portland cement, building board, gypsum products, and metal sash all have risen relative to lumber.

Obviously, then, raw material prices alone cannot fully explain lumber's displacement. Comparative costs of installation also have been an important consideration. Most notably, lumber has found it difficult to compete in view of the labor savings made possible by plywood, gypsum board, sheetrock, and other sheet materials for wall sheathing and subflooring.

Noncost considerations have also played an important part in lumber's competitive problems. Other industries have tended to develop stronger programs in the fields of research, development, trade promotion, and marketing. For one reason, lumber is far less concentrated than any other major industry—its 20 largest firms account for a smaller share of total shipments than the top 4 in each of the other major industrial categories—and thus it encounters difficulties in marshaling resources for developmental and promotional work.

For the same reason, lumber enterprises are commonly in no position to maintain large-scale research facilities. About half of the research undertaken today in lumber and lumber products is financed by a handful of large firms, and most of the remainder is spent by associations and the Federal Government. Firms engaged in producing plywood, pulp and paper, and various building boards have a much stronger record in research and development and in trade promotion, largely because of the very large size of a number of corporations in those competing fields.

CANADA RULES THE WAVES

Rising imports pose perhaps an even greater problem for the industry today. Lumber imports expanded fivefold between 1947 and 1963, and now account for almost 16 percent of the U.S. market. Canada has accounted for more than 95 percent of total imports over the past decade; the remainder, almost entirely pine, has come from Mexico and South America.

In recent years, this country has taken at least three-fourths of Canada's lumber exports. Since 1969, in fact, Canada has sold more south of the border than in its own home market. Most of these shipments have been common construction grades of spruce, Douglas-fir, and hemlock from the coastal and interior regions of British Columbia, which in effect are northern extensions of producing regions lying in the United States. For the most part, British Columbia producers are as favorably located with respect to U.S. markets as are their competitors in the Pacific Northwest.

One segment of the Canadian trade has grown extremely rapidly—waterborne shipments from British Columbia to the Atlantic Coast. These imports compete directly with water shipments from west coast mills. A decade ago, about three-quarters of this trade originated in Washington, Oregon, and

March 11, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A1123

Sixty-three Congressmen Urge Full Use of Federal Powers To Prevent Further Violence in Selma, Ala., and Call for Legislation Protecting the Right To Vote

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JOHN CONYERS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 23, 1965

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, 63 Members of the House of Representatives, 52 Democrats and 11 Republicans, joined on March 10, 1965, in sending a telegram to President Johnson urging him to use the full powers of his office to prevent further violence in Selma, Ala. The 63 Congressmen also supported additional legislation which will provide Federal remedies to those citizens of Alabama and elsewhere in America who are being denied the right to vote by discriminatory and arbitrary methods.

I am using this previously granted permission to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to express my great admiration and respect for these 63 colleagues—and the many other Members who have sent similar messages to the President—for expressing their feeling that the recent events in Selma, Ala., have been so serious that Federal action is necessary.

Mr. Speaker, if you will excuse me a certain amount of parochial pride, I would like to point out that all the members of the Michigan delegation, Democrats and Republicans, joined in a separate telegram to President Johnson urging the maximum use of Federal power to prevent further violence and to protect constitutional rights in Selma, Ala. I am particularly proud to serve with a State delegation that is so concerned about finally winning the struggle to achieve human dignity for every American citizen.

I also want to express my admiration for those Members who made such cogent and eloquent remarks here on the floor of the House about the responsibility of the Federal Government to protect Americans using their constitutional rights from the brutal use of power by local police officials. I noted with great interest that so many Members have pointed out that the events in Selma illustrated the critical need for Federal legislation authorizing Federal voting registrars in those areas where local officials refuse to register qualified American citizens. Many Members have also discussed the need to eliminate the use of literacy tests as a means of arbitrarily discriminating against Negro Americans.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that the telegram to President Johnson and the list of 63 Congressmen who signed it be printed in the RECORD immediately following my remarks.

We Members of the House of Representatives urge you to use the full powers of your office to prevent further violence in Selma, Ala., against Negro Americans, striving to

gain their right to register and vote who are relying on the first amendment's guarantee of "The right of the people peaceably to assemble and petition the Government for redress of grievances."

We feel that local law and order has broken down in Selma, Ala., just as it did in Little Rock, Ark., on September 24, 1957, Oxford, Miss., on September 30, 1962, and various Alabama communities on June 11 and September 10, 1963, when two of your predecessors, one a Democrat and one a Republican, relied on their powers under sections 332, 333, 334, title 10, United States Code, to suppress domestic violence, unlawful combinations, conspiracies depriving American citizens of rights secured to them by the U.S. Constitution and Federal law.

The disgraceful and arbitrary exercise of the State police powers in Selma, Ala., on Sunday, March 8, 1965, dramatically demonstrated that State and local officials not only permitted but participated in an illegal and brutal suppression of a peaceful assembly by Negro citizens protesting the denial of their right to vote.

We feel confident that you will utilize all the resources of your office, both moral suasion and any Federal troops or marshals that might be needed, to remedy the violation of the Bill of Rights in Selma, Ala.

We further urge you to endorse additional legislation which will provide Federal remedies to those citizens of Alabama and elsewhere in America who are being denied their right to vote by discriminatory and arbitrary methods.

THOMAS S. ASHLEY, Democrat, of Ohio; JONATHAN B. BINGHAM, Democrat, of New York; JOHN A. BLATNIK, Democrat, of Minnesota; RICHARD BOLLING, Democrat, of Missouri; JOHN BRADEMANS, Democrat, of Indiana; GEORGE E. BROWN, JR., Democrat, of California; HUGH L. CAREY, Democrat, of New York; ELFORD A. CEDERBERG, Republican, of Michigan; JAMES C. CLEVELAND, Republican, of New Hampshire; RAYMOND F. CLEVELINGER, Democrat, of Michigan; JEFFERY COHELAN, Democrat, of California; JOHN CONYERS, JR., Democrat, of Michigan; JAMES C. CORMAN, Democrat, of California; EMILIO Q. DADARIO, Democrat, of Connecticut; CHARLES C. DIGGS, JR., Democrat, of Michigan; JOHN C. DINGELL, Democrat, of Michigan.

JOHN G. DOW, Democrat, of New York; KEN W. DYAL, Democrat, of California; DON EDWARDS, Democrat, of California; LEONARD FARBSTEIN, Democrat, of New York; BILLIE S. FARNUM, Democrat, of Michigan; PAUL A. FINO, Republican, of New York; JACOB H. GILBERT, Democrat, of New York; EDITH GREEN, Democrat, of Oregon; SEYMOUR HALPERN, Republican, of New York; JAMES HARVEY, Republican, of Michigan; AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS, Democrat, of California; WAYNE L. HAYS, Democrat, of Ohio; FRANK J. HORTON, Republican, of New York; ANDREW JACOBS, JR., Democrat, of Indiana; ROBERT W. KASTERMEIER, Democrat, of Wisconsin.

PAUL J. KREBS, Democrat, of New Jersey; JOHN V. LINDSAY, Republican, of New York; JOHN C. MACKIE, Democrat, of Michigan; RAY J. MADDEN, Democrat, of Indiana; RICHARD D. MCCARTHY, Democrat, of New York; ROBERT McCLODY, Republican, of Illinois; CHARLES McC. MATTHIAS, JR., Republican, of Maryland; SPARK M. MATSUNAGA, Democrat, of Hawaii; PATSY MINK, Democrat, of Hawaii; WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD, Democrat, of Pennsylvania; F. BRADFORD MORSE, Republican, of Massachusetts; LUCIEN N. NEZZI, Democrat, of Michigan; ROBERT N. C. NIX, Democrat, of Pennsylvania; JAMES G. O'HARA, Democrat, of Michigan; THOMAS P. O'NEILL, Democrat, of Massachusetts; ADAM CLAYTON POWELL, Democrat, of New York.

OGDEN R. REID, Republican, of New York; JOSEPH Y. RESNICK, Democrat, of New York; HENRY S. REUSS, Democrat, of Wisconsin; TENO RONCALIO, Democrat, of Wyoming; JAMES ROOSEVELT, Democrat, of California;

BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL, Democrat, of New York; EDWARD R. ROYBAL, Democrat, of California; WILLIAM F. RYAN, Democrat, of New York; JAMES H. SCHEUER, Democrat, of New York; WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE, Democrat, of Connecticut; SAMUEL S. STRATTON, Democrat, of New York; HERBERT TENZER, Democrat, of New York; FRANK THOMPSON, JR., Democrat, of New Jersey; PAUL H. TODD, JR., Democrat, of Michigan; CHARLES A. VANER, Democrat, of Ohio; WESTON E. VIVIAN, Democrat, of Michigan.

Happy Birthday Wish to Mr. Broadway-55th

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ROBERT E. SWEENEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 11, 1965

Mr. SWEENEY. Mr. Speaker, it is a sincere pleasure for me today to call the attention of my colleagues in tribute to a man who has made himself a legend in his hometown and who is affectionately known there as "Mr. Broadway-55th," my friend, Mr. Charlie Hronek, of Cleveland, Ohio.

The fine editorial in the Cleveland Press under date of February 17, 1965, by its editor, Louis B. Seltzer, gives expression to the warm feelings of the many people of Cleveland who know Charlie and have been inspired by his dedication to his community and his neighbors.

With your permission, I include the editorial as follows:

It was something like 45 years ago and this was the first time he had ever presided at a meeting where there was an "imported" speaker.

And it was the first time that I have ever spoken formally before any public group.

We were both about the same height, and weight, and age—and, as it turned out in noon-hour conversation, of the same temperament, and enjoyed the same interests. We became friends.

"I will never leave Broadway and 55th," he told me. "This is where I will make my entire life. I love this 'Zizkov' area and want more than anything else to help build it along with the rest of the city."

I confided in him my own love for Greater Cleveland.

"Like yourself, Charlie, I have determined never to leave Cleveland, my native city," I said. "Only the other day I was invited to go to Washington. It was an attractive offer. Marion and I decided against it."

"We want to stay here. You came to the Broadway-55th area almost before you could either walk or talk. You love it. The people love you. Your work and interests will keep you here. We both can make careers in our own community—and let us keep in touch with each other."

Charlie Hronek gave me a better introduction than my first speech deserved. Nevertheless, it was one of the most enjoyable experiences of my life. And I had made a new friend—one who was to be a friend all of our mutual lives.

That friendship has now lasted more than 45 years. We have met many times. We have reminisced many times. We have talked glowingly about the future many times. With Charlie Hronek it was always about his beloved Broadway-55th area, and with an affectionate intensity that multiplied with the passing years.

A1124

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

March 11, 1965

The other Sunday night we were once more together, at a church meeting (in the church, Our Lady of Lourdes, over which our mutual friend, the late Monsignor Oldrich Zlamal, presided for so many years).

Once again I was the scheduled speaker. Once again—as many years before—Charlie Hronek was at the speaker's table. And once again two friends reviewed the past and attempted to visualize the future.

After I had talked, "Mr. Broadway-55th" slyly remarked:

"Louie, you've improved after 45 years."

"Charlie," I replied, "I had to—there was a long way to go after that first one."

The other day Charlie Hronek had a birthday. Broadway-55th turned out for it. The immigrant boy from Bohemia who has dedicated his whole life to the vast neighborhood he loves expressed its affection and regard for him.

The people in the Broadway-55th area remember the endless list of things Charlie Hronek has done. They remember how Charlie and Leonard Smith organized the Broadway-55th Association. How they helped the churches, the businesses, the public problems, inspired others to love and affection for Broadway-55th—stimulated a pride which has ruggedly reflected itself in the way homes and businesses and family gathering places have been maintained and protected.

For 48 years Charlie Hronek has participated in virtually every important civic, religious and cultural event in the old Broadway area. He has been a friend to all of the old and new leaders there for a half century.

People in old Broadway still talk about Charlie Hronek's valiant efforts to make sure no depositor in the old Atlas Savings & Loan Association was hurt when it closed during the depression of the 1930's, along with other banks and savings and loan companies.

Honors have been reciprocally bestowed upon Charlie by "his people"—president of St. Joseph Society No. 156, Czech Catholic Union; vice president of the National Czech Catholic Union; president of the District Alliance of Czech Catholics; past president of Ceska Sin Carlin Hall; president of the St. Wenceslas Day Committee, and a director of the National Alliance of Czech Nationals.

He is recognized as one of the foremost Czech leaders in America. Whenever the subject of Bohemian culture is discussed the conversation usually turns toward the great Bohemian band organized by the young, dedicated, and enthusiastic Charlie Hronek 46 years ago.

Perhaps one of the foremost recollections of the people in old Broadway—and in all of Greater Cleveland, for that matter—is how Charlie Hronek conceived the original idea for the great annual Czech pilgrimage to St. Anthony's Shrine in Chatham, Canada. They also talk about how Charlie went on the pilgrimage this past year and returned a well man.

Out in the old Broadway area they do a great deal of talking about Charlie Hronek—the boy who came there, stayed, and gave his heart, and life, and devotion to the Broadway-55th area he has made so extricable a part of his whole being.

Some of us who have watched Charlie Hronek in his lifelong dedication and ceaseless effort to make his beloved Broadway-55th area good in both the sight of men and God not only respect and admire him for it, but venerate him, also, as does everybody in the whole old Broadway area.

He truly is "Mr. Broadway-55th" in every sense of the phrase—in every part of his being. As a lifelong friend I join in wishing Charlie Hronek a belated but earnest happy birthday—and many more in the future.

The War in Vietnam—XII

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 11, 1965

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the 12th in a series of a report on Vietnam by Mr. Lucian C. Warren, Washington correspondent for the Courier-Express, Buffalo, N.Y. Mr. Warren recently returned from Vietnam and part XII, which appeared in the Courier-Express, on March 4, 1965, follows:

THE WAR IN VIETNAM, XII—VICTORY POSSIBLE
STILWELL ASSERTS

(By Lucian C. Warren)

(NOTE.—Maj. Gen. Richard G. Stilwell, who grew up in Buffalo and was graduated from Bennett High School, ranks third in command of the U.S. forces which are helping South Vietnam in its fight against Communism infiltrators. Here General Stilwell, a member of the 1933 class at West Point, discusses with Lucian C. Warren, Washington correspondent for the Courier-Express, the complicated military and political problems facing the Saigon Government.)

SAIGON.—Buffalo's Maj. Gen. Richard G. Stilwell feels that victory is possible in south-east Asia.

"I say the war can be won," the chief of staff of the U.S. Military Assistance Command, Vietnam, declared in an exclusive interview. "It can be lost, too, but there's no damn reason why it should."

However, there are numerous pitfalls and obstacles that in some ways make this a war harder to fight than World War II and Korea, the general asserted in two sessions with this correspondent, lasting well over an hour. The main problems, he indicated, were the sanctuary from which the North Vietnamese has operated to export supplies and men to subvert the independent nation to the south, and the political problems of a still unstable South Vietnamese Government.

STAFF CHIEF

General Stilwell is the third highest ranking officer with the U.S. military forces here, serving directly under the overall commander, Gen. William C. Westmoreland, and his deputy commander, Lt. Gen. John L. Throckmorton. He has been in South Vietnam for nearly 2 years, serving as assistant chief of staff for operations until last April, when he became chief of staff.

He is the son of the late William G. Stilwell and of Mrs. Mina Stilwell Hamilton, of 352 Parkridge Avenue, Buffalo. His wife is the former Alice K. Simpson of Buffalo. Mrs. Stilwell and their three younger children, acting under orders from President Johnson directing all military men's dependents in South Vietnam to be evacuated, recently left for temporary residence in Honolulu.

IN THREE MAJOR WARS

An active participant in the three major wars which the United States has fought in the last 25 years, General Stilwell declines to say that this one is nastier than the other two.

There were plenty of atrocities in the earlier wars, he said.

Nevertheless, the present ground rules under which the war in South Vietnam is being fought complicates the task of winning it, he maintains.

World War II, in which he was an opera-

tions officer for a tough hombres division and a later assistant chief of staff for G-3 of the 22d Army Corps, was described by Stilwell as a total engagement where our combat forces could be fully utilized in the simple objective of annihilating the enemy.

KOREAN STRUGGLE

Korea, where the Buffalo military man led the 15th Infantry Regiment of the 8d Infantry Division in combat and later was a senior adviser to the Korean Army Corps, was not a total engagement of the enemy forces, Stilwell points out. Because of the sanctuary the Chinese Reds enjoyed north of the Yalu River, the war in Korea was limited as to battleground and weapons and on terms of overall forces engaged.

"But even in Korea," he explained, "there was no limitation on the employment of weapons in the hands of the U.S. forces."

Incidentally, the general feels that the United States might have gotten away with bombing north of the Yalu River as far as the Korean war was concerned, but there might have been repercussions by Russian military threats in Europe, where NATO was still weak.

VIEW ON MAC ARTHUR CASE

General Stilwell also believes that President Truman had no alternative in firing Gen. Douglas MacArthur for insubordination, even though General Stilwell has the greatest respect for MacArthur as a "soldier, a commander, a war strategist, and a dedicated patriot."

Continuing with his war comparisons, Stilwell noted that even in Korea "we still were fighting a conventional war, with an identifiable enemy organization. It was a war where we could plot our positions on the map and prepare strong defenses on the ground."

The general paused, shook his head sadly, then commented:

"But we do not have this situation in South Vietnam. We are not directly confronting the enemy on the ground. And we are providing operational support assistance in this battle, rather than directly engaging the enemy."

COMPLICATED TASK

The task is immensely complicated, the general declared, because the objective to knock out the enemy's armed capability is proving extremely difficult without the destruction also of his political organization.

As long as the North Vietnamese have their sanctuary north of the 17th parallel, the enemy's political organization cannot be destroyed.

"Probably," Stilwell reflected, "the maximum we can expect in this war is to force the enemy to suspend action if he finds the engagement has become too costly. However, I do not see how we can force him to demobilize under the present ground rules."

Frustrated by limitations on annihilating the enemy, the United States is also frustrated by the nature of its relations with its ally, South Vietnam.

PROBLEMS

The United States cannot exercise full control over the military or "pacification" operations of the South Vietnamese Government. A language barrier and differing cultural and political traditions are also obstacles to a smooth joint conduct of the war against the Vietcong.

Stilwell suggests the successful conduct of the war against the Vietcong is directly related to the stability of the South Vietnamese Government. He pointed out that the war was going relatively well until the Diem government was overthrown in May 1963, after which there was a serious deterioration of the South Vietnamese-United States military position and a resulting buildup of Vietcong strength.

VITAL FACTOR

"I feel very strongly that one of the indispensable conditions for an upward trend in our fight against the Vietcong is a stable and strong government apparatus at the national and provincial level," he maintains. "In the long run, we cannot have an effective military machine without a viable political framework in which to operate."

The general is in agreement with an assessment of the current military situation in South Vietnam that over the last year the United States-Vietnamese military political efforts have gone downhill in relation to the area and population under control by the Vietcong.

HOPEFUL

But he made it clear that the United States military strength has also increased and he has hopes that if the new civilian South Vietnamese Government becomes strong and stable, the military tide can well turn against the Vietcong.

"The National Government must provide the resources with which to provide a good framework of Government if successful military operations are to be achieved," he insists. And by a strong government, he doesn't mean one controlled by the military.

"I feel very strongly that the chief executive must be a civilian," he said.

Given a strong government, Stilwell sees the possibility of a stepped-up political-military offensive against the Hanoi-directed war of subversion that might well force the main bulk of the enemy to withdraw, leaving only the so-called national liberation front to operate on a small, easily contained scale.

SUMMARY OF VIEWS

"This contest," says the general in summary, "can be resolved in a manner compatible with U.S. objectives and compatible with the desires of the local populace."

"It can be, but whether it will be or not, depends on the collective will and determination and the energetic action of the people of South Vietnam and America."

"Yes, the condition could arise where we would have to pull out of South Vietnam in defeat. But this will only happen if we are weak and stupid in the execution of our policies."

Not all the interview was about war.

The general spoke with great affection about his Buffalo background.

RECALLS SCHOOL CHUMS

A graduate of Bennett High School in 1933, he recalled that he was chummy with a group there that included Paul J. Keeler, son of City Judge Patrick Keeler, Clarence Buchwald and John Sheldon. Keeler is now a New York City attorney, Buchwald a Seneca Falls businessman, and Sheldon an executive of the Hewitt Rubber Co. in the Philadelphia area.

He also got to know his future wife at Bennett and she was graduated there the same year.

"But I really didn't have a chance with her until I got my uniform," he said smilingly. Their romance was carried on while she was a student at Beaver College, Jenkintown, Pa., and he was at West Point, and they were married soon after his graduation from the Military Academy in 1938. The general is proud that he later became commandant at West Point.

ATHLETE

The general remembers that he went out for track at Bennett, but won no great distinction as a high school athlete. He did enjoy, however, being a member of the West Side Rowing Club crew. And he's grateful to the late Representative Walter G. Andrews of Buffalo, for his West Point appointment after he had been recommended by a selection board consisting of the principals of Buffalo area schools.

General Stilwell was last in Buffalo in January 1963, when he made the principal speech at the Eagle Scout recognition ceremony.

An insight into the love the general has for Buffalo is provided in the opening remarks of this talk.

REMARKS CITED

He said then:

"It is a great personal honor to participate in this ceremony. It is an honor because my roots are in this, the Queen City of the Great Lakes."

"It is here that I, like you, participated in the wonderful world of scouting; attended elementary and then high school; was a member of a church and drew sustenance from its activities; experienced all the challenges and delights of youth, and, above all, was molded by a Christian home environment and guided by the love and devotion of my two parents."

"Through 5 years of college at Brown and West Point, and 25 years of Government service all over the world, I have become increasingly conscious that the cumulative intakes from my Buffalo boyhood have provided the mental, physical, and moral foundations which have sustained me in hours of crisis."

Illusions and False Analogies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT W. KASTENMEIER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 11, 1965

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, much thought is being given to our policy in South Vietnam and many arguments are being offered almost daily in the editorial pages of the great newspapers of this country. I found the thoughtful analysis of the St. Louis Post-Dispatch editorial which was reprinted in the Madison Capital Times on February 26, 1965, realistic and helpful to me in evaluating our policy in southeast Asia. I am inserting this editorial in the RECORD so that others can have the opportunity to study it:

[From the Madison (Wis.) Capital Times, Feb. 26, 1965]

ILLUSIONS AND FALSE ANALOGIES

Assuming that there is still time to think about Vietnam—that the deadly cycle of military escalation is not yet irreversible—Americans should examine the validity of the official rationale for the "reprisal" bombings of North Vietnam.

The rationale is that attacks on South Vietnamese and American bases are planned, armed, and supplied predominantly from the north, and that the attacks will stop if we hit the north hard enough.

The fatal flaw in this theory is that the major portion of the weapons used by the Vietcong are American weapons, captured, and turned against us. While supplies from the north undoubtedly help the Vietcong, there is little basis for supposing that they are indispensable, or that the Vietcong would fade away if supply lines could be cut—even if the lines could be cut by air action alone, which is most improbable.

Should it not be clear by now that we are not dealing with a simple case of external aggression, as the official policy of our Government assumes? If after 10 years of steadily increasing American aid the South Viet-

namese Government is weaker than it was before, then something other than externally supported subversion must be involved.

All the evidence points to a high degree of local sympathy or outright support for the Vietcong as a major element in its success. The bombing of North Vietnam does not touch this source of conflict and probably strengthens it.

The false assumption of external aggression as the essential element in the situation is strategic as well as tactical. It is one of the major reasons our forces are in Vietnam.

Apologists for official policy are fond of quoting Churchill's warning after the partition of Czechoslovakia in 1938—"The belief that security can be obtained by throwing a small state to the wolves is a fatal delusion."

Czechoslovakia, however, was a victim of direct external aggression. What we face in Vietnam is the quite different problem of an indigenous revolution, 25 years in the making, which has succeeded in ending French colonialism and withstanding 10 years of American intervention.

In such a situation even our great military strength does not give us power to decide, by a simple decision to fight, that a small state shall be "saved." It is one thing to go to the aid of a nation under overt attack, and another to interfere in a local revolution, in which the essential element is not external aid but the people themselves. Only they can "win the war," and after 10 years of not winning, South Vietnam's will and capacity to do so must now be doubted.

Some Americans, of course, believe that it is our national mission to police the world, particularly to police it against revolution. That belief, in our view, is as immature as isolationism was, and indeed may well be an overreaction to isolationism.

The United States tried to turn its back on the world, and failed; participation in the second world war established firmly the commonsense proposition that for America involvement in international affairs is unavoidable.

But what is involvement? Some Americans evidently swung so far from their isolationist past that they regard involvement as deciding everything for everybody, and particularly deciding the nature and scope of social revolution anywhere.

A role in world leadership certainly is the American mission, but we need a more sensible view of what world leadership really is.

The truth is that Vietnam does not present a simple case of external aggression, direct, or indirect, and a policy based on that false assumption is bound to fail, as ours has failed for 10 years. No matter how strenuously we may justify the bombing of North Vietnam to ourselves, and no matter how well it might be defended as pure reprisal or revenge, the fact remains that there is no military solution to the problem so far as the United States is concerned.

If we step up our attacks and the degree of our involvement, and even if we do not provoke Chinese or Russian intervention, all we can really expect is to take over the whole war from the South Vietnamese—in other words, to occupy and govern South Vietnam indefinitely.

What would such an occupation gain for us? It would not serve our true national interests, it would poison our relations with half the world, and it would hamper our freedom of maneuver in more important areas of conflict.

Our Vietnam policy is at a dead end. Our interests can now be served only by a political rather than a military solution, one that will enable us ultimately to end a profitless involvement in a profitless Asian land war. Unless President Johnson is seeking a political solution, he is not only risking nuclear war but basing national policy on dangerous illusions.

March 11, 1965

A1126

Housing for the Elderly, Quincy, Mass.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES A. BURKE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 11, 1965

Mr. BURKE. Mr. Speaker, it was my pleasure, on March 6, 1965, to be the principal speaker at the ground breaking ceremonies of the housing for the elderly in Quincy, Mass.

A new, multistory apartment building for senior citizens is to be constructed with a \$2,583,000 senior citizens housing loan under Public Law 88-372 from the Community Facilities Administration. The project is being sponsored by the Quincy Point Congregational Church through the Quincy Point Congregational Church Homes. The Reverend Bedras Baharian is the president of the corporation. This is the second such loan in Massachusetts under Public Law 88-372 and is to serve primarily the Quincy, Weymouth, and Braintree areas in Norfolk County. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include an article from the Quincy Patriot Ledger, Quincy, Mass., on March 8, 1965, relating to this event:

GROUND BROKEN FOR ELDERLY HOUSING

QUINCY.—Ground was broken Saturday for the 216-apartment building for the elderly which will be built at 100 Southern Artery by the Quincy Point Congregational Church Homes Co., a nonprofit corporation.

READY NEXT YEAR

Tenants in the new building, which will be ready for occupancy by April 1, 1966, will be from the middle-lower income group with weekly pay of less than \$100. Guest speaker Congressman JAMES A. BURKE, Democrat, of Milton, said that this group comprises 16 percent of Quincy's population. Residents from Weymouth and Braintree also will live in the new apartments.

Congressman BURKE noted that the building will be the largest direct-loan housing for elderly in the State. He added that special technology will be used to make the apartment suited to the elderly, such as omitting steep stairways, narrow halls and polished floors.

Apartment trustees were called builders with real roots in the business and community service units by Mr. BURKE. He also credited the Quincy Development Commission and the Patriot Ledger with encouragement in the project.

Other speakers at the groundbreaking were Quincy City Councilor President Joseph LaRaia; Robert Fitzgerald, who represented his cousin, Senator EDWARD M. KENNEDY; and William A. O'Connell, executive vice president of the Quincy-South Shore Chamber of Commerce. Senator LEVERETT SALTONSTALL sent greetings by wire.

Mrs. Carl E. Magnuson, who applied for the first apartment 2 years ago, turned the first sod at the ceremonies. Taking part in the ceremonies were the Reverend Bedros Baharian, pastor of the Quincy Point Congregational Church; Herbert Hendry, treasurer; Everett Besse, clerk; and the Reverend Elden Zuern, associate pastor. The invocation was given by the Reverend John D. Banks, pastor of Bethany Congregational Church; and the Reverend Albert J. Penner of the Massachusetts Congregational Society gave the benediction.

Among the 150 guests at the groundbreaking ceremonies were city councilors and rep-

resentatives of local civic groups, as well as State representatives.

Work on the apartment project is expected to begin this month by the Tornabene Bros., of Newton, who bid \$2,162,800. The total cost of the project, including land, will be \$2,583,000.

My remarks at the ceremony follow:

Mr. Chairman, reverend clergy, ladies and gentlemen, it is a genuine pleasure to participate with you today, in these groundbreaking ceremonies that I know mean so much to you. On this site, you are about to build the largest direct-loan-housing-for-the-elderly project in this State. Of course, it is fitting, that with large problems, there arise large solutions.

The Massachusetts study of our problems, presented to the White House Conference on Aging, said, and I quote:

"The physical nature of many modern American homes and apartments is such that they are not appropriate dwelling units for older persons. There are steep and narrow stairways, narrow halls, highly polished floors, weak and flimsy bathroom accessories, etc. A special technology has developed around the most suitable physical standards for housing for older persons."

The report went on to suggest that there was an immediate need in Massachusetts for 8,000 to 10,000 apartments for older persons in the low-income group, and approximately the same for those in the middle-income brackets.

This project we are dedicating today makes a dent in the need for those in the lower-middle income group, those in the under-\$5,000 bracket. I would only hope that those listening and watching this event will take a lesson and imitate the concept, if not the details, of what is being created here.

There are so many fine things to point out in this project, that I shall only remark on a few that strike me as an example of local wisdom and thoughtfulness, in the preparation of this program. For one, it is located right where people live, not far out in the country, away from the general community. You may be insulating your elderly, away from some of the noises, by putting them in one building, but they are not isolated, away from everyone else. In that, you have shown foresight and understanding of their real needs.

You have planned an activity center that can absorb many of the elderly both in the building and in the surrounding neighborhood as well. I would hope that some of the four Golden Age Clubs that meet in this area will consider sharing your facilities and services and possibly even provide tenants.

I would hope that some of the displacees from the Quarry Street project will find their way here to help resume their interrupted lives in a congenial atmosphere.

You have organized a fine board of trustees, building from strength, with real roots in your business and service community. When I look around and see sales managers, engineers, accountants, manufacturers, electrical contractors, insurance men, ministers, and volunteers and service leaders of every sort, I am reassured, since I know that the strength of our community is represented in the project leadership.

You have powerful encouragement from the Quincy Development Commission and the Patriot Ledger to further underline the extent of your roots.

You are exploring relationships with a host of local service agencies to help provide the residents with the personal services that they will need in their daily lives, without turning the project into an all-encompassing home for the aged. Rather, you are directing social and medical services into the project to meet individual need, instead of managing their lives for them.

You have chosen your ground well, since this particular area of Quincy has one of the highest percentages of elderly in the State, 16.4 percent over 60, as of the 1960 census. Yet you have planned large enough to help serve the needs of Braintree and Weymouth, as well.

In the building, your efficiencies and one-bedroom apartments will help to satisfy the need for efficient, safe, and sanitary housing, far better adapted to the needs of older persons.

You have turned to the Federal Government for financing, but this is no dole. Rather, the elderly residents themselves will be repaying the loan over a term of 50 years in their rent, paying taxes and contributing to improving their neighborhood, while, at the same time, helping to meet their own housing needs. This, to me, is the ideal partnership of people in a community, working together toward a noble social goal, yet helping themselves at the same time.

In particular, I want to commend your leadership, especially Rev. Bedros Baharian, for his inspiration, persistence, and understanding, in helping to make this project a reality.

When this building is finished and ready to open, I want you to invite me back again, so that I can see for myself what you have created.

May Almighty God shower His blessings on your good works.

National Council of Churches Supports Immigration Reform

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 11, 1965

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, the National Council of Churches has long been an advocate of immigration reform and in this regard the council on February 24, 1965, adopted a resolution reiterating this historic concern of the churches and a reaffirmation that essential change in our immigration policy is vitally important to our national well-being. In order that the Members of this House can be kept abreast of the general feeling on immigration policy I am proud to include this resolution in the RECORD:

RESOLUTION ON THE CHURCHES AND U.S. IMMIGRATION POLICY, ADOPTED FEBRUARY 24, 1965

Whereas insights from Christian faith and from the nature of a free society suggest that people should be afforded the opportunities to move voluntarily for economic and social reasons, for reuniting their families, or for availing themselves and their loved ones of greater opportunities; to seek asylum from religious, social, political, and racial persecution; and to find sanctuary from natural calamities or oppressive occupation; the National Council of Churches in light of current governmental developments deems it timely to reiterate this historic concern of the churches and reaffirm its belief that the United States should make essential changes in its immigration law which will provide the opportunities here listed.

Whereas the National Council of Churches and constituent communions have repeatedly stated that the immigration policy of our land raises inequitable racial and na-

tional barriers, unfairly restricts the movement of peoples into our country on the basis of place of birth, and unjustly discriminates against refugees and naturalized citizens, and

Whereas the President of the United States called upon the country in his state of the Union address on January 4, 1965, and in his message to the Congress on January 13, 1965, to consider basic revisions to the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952, along the same lines that the National Council of Churches and constituent communions have consistently called for: Be it therefore

Resolved, That the general board of the National Council of the Churches of Christ in the U.S.A. once again call upon the churches to promote study and encourage action which will lead to legislation to improve the immigration statutes of the United States, so that their provisions will be more in accord with Christian and humanitarian principles recognizing the inherent worth and dignity of the individual, a concept upon which our country is founded and to which it is dedicated; and so that their provisions will promote the national interest of our own and other countries as well as the welfare of the individuals who may benefit by migration; be it further

Resolved, That the general board of the National Council of Churches call upon the constituent membership of the National Council of Churches to note and study further in more specific terms the problems and new opportunities in the field of immigration and refugee policy and take considered and prayerful action to the end that barriers shall be removed within the limits of national and community responsibility by:

1. Using the latest census of the total population as the basis for determining the number of quota immigrants to be admitted;
2. The elimination of the national origins quota system;
3. The abolition of the Asia-Pacific triangle;
4. The admission of persons whose skills would be advantageous to the United States;
5. The facilitating of family reunions;
6. The implementation of a program of refugee admission, under established visa procedures, so that our country would accept its fair share of the world's refugees;
7. The enabling of persons with physical and mental disabilities to join their families, provided adequate safeguards are maintained to prevent their becoming public charges;
8. The provision of more equitable and just methods in deportation proceedings, under due process of the law; and
9. The provision for naturalized citizens to receive equal treatment in every respect with natural-born citizens; be it further

Resolved, That authorization be hereby granted for appropriate representatives of the National Council of Churches to consult with Government officials and agencies and to testify before congressional committees on the basis of official policies of the National Council of Churches concerning immigration and refugees—policies which seek the good of persons, the higher interest of the nations, and more peace, justice, and freedom in the world.

Eulogy to Frank X. Cull

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ROBERT E. SWEENEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 11, 1965

Mr. SWEENEY. Mr. Speaker, I was saddened today to learn of the passing

of one of Cleveland's fine citizens, Frank X. Cull, a celebrated civil trial lawyer for more than 50 years, who at the age of 77 had achieved the highest respect of his colleagues and of the citizens of Cleveland, Ohio.

Early in his career, Frank X. Cull served on the Hill as secretary to former U.S. Senator Robert J. Bulkley before returning to Cleveland to build an enviable record in a profession that is careful with its accolades.

Frank X. Cull will be sincerely missed by the entire membership of the Ohio bar, and most particularly by his professional associates in the firm of Hauxhurst, Sharp, Cull & Kellogg, with whom he has been in practice over a long period of years.

Rescuing the New Haven

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JOHN S. MONAGAN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 11, 1965

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, there have been many arguments and formulas advanced in the effort to "rescue" the New Haven Railroad and to safeguard against the inconvenience to commuters that would result from the proposed abandonment of commuter service.

There has come to me today an editorial which appeared in the March 8 edition of the Meriden, Conn., Morning Record which contains recommendations that I find interesting and which, I believe, are deserving of thorough study.

With permission to extend my remarks, I include at this point the editorial, "Rescuing the New Haven":

RESCUING THE NEW HAVEN

In Hartford and in Washington, hearings are open and arguments are being heard on how to rescue the New Haven Railroad. The bankrupt line has been losing money steadily under its trusteeship management; it has petitioned the ICC to allow a curtailment of commuter service close to New York, and the shape of things to come clearly indicates a gradual closing down of all passenger service unless something is done. What are the alternatives, and how would they affect Connecticut and the whole area served by the New Haven?

LET IT DIE?

What would happen if no subsidies were provided, no help were given, the railroad were allowed to go on its way downhill? We could expect continuation of freight service with gradual elimination of passenger service as equipment deteriorated and income continued to fall. Eventually we would be forced to see takeover by the Government or sale as distressed assets to the highest bidder. At worst, we could expect complete collapse of all service with virtual disintegration of stock and real estate; at best, minimal operation after a period of standstill.

New England can't afford this solution; on this there is general agreement. Our highways can't stand the load that a dying railroad would shift to them, our people can't stand the loss of public transportation, our businesses can't stand the attrition that poor railroad service would force on the whole northeast corner of the country. The New Haven has got to be rescued.

THE RIBICOFF APPROACH

Senator ABRAHAM RIBICOFF, of Connecticut, has proposed a rescue operation through a \$100 million fund to be voted by Congress. It would be administered by the Interstate Commerce Commission which could use it to help the New Haven and other commuter lines which are in difficulty. The figure of \$10 million has been used hopefully as the New Haven's probable Federal share, to be matched by Connecticut and New York which would each put in \$5 million, to make a \$20 million rescue subsidy.

Subsidies are necessary to keep the road running, and they must be provided. But the Ribicoff bill by itself is not enough. We are against any simple subsidy that will keep the road running on its present inefficient system without moving toward a constructive permanent cure for the things that cause the need for subsidy—it's just prolonging the agony.

We also question the appropriation of \$100 million on a nationwide basis to cure ills that are basically regional—again on a simple subsidy-to-deficit pattern. The New Haven is the sickest of several railroads in many parts of the country which aren't as healthy as they should be. Will the subsidy encourage them to sit back and wait for help, instead of seeking more constructive ways to compete?

MERGER

The New York Central and the Pennsylvania Railroads would like to merge. Both moneymakers at present, they aren't eager to include the losing New Haven in their plans, but they might be interested in buying the freight operation. Pressure could be brought through Congress, the ICC, and State agencies for an inclusion either of the New Haven freight operation or the whole railroad.

In effect, this would be a forced marriage; if it were carried out, the New Haven, and especially its passenger service, shouldn't expect to get favored treatment in the new combine. For a while, the big merged line would absorb the losses on the New Haven passenger runs. But considering the problem, it could hardly be expected to sink the necessary massive amounts of capital on a permanent basis into new equipment and improved service; more likely would be a continuation of the present gradual deterioration and a renewed petitioning for permission to curtail passenger service.

THE NEW YORK PLAN

New York is going to be squeezed the most and the tightest by any cutback. If commuter service is phased out, the traffic problem is going to turn New York City into a shambles. For this reason, Governor Rockefeller came up recently with a bold new plan for a takeover of dying railroads, beginning with the Long Island Railroad, under a new State metropolitan commuter authority which would undertake a \$200 million modernization program. There would be room for other railroads and other States in a tri-state commuter system, which would be eligible for Federal aid under Washington's urban transportation program.

It may be a fine plan for New York and the LIRR. But it begins by regarding the railroad as a commuter line, which is only part of its value to Connecticut. This State should be careful not to join in too quickly to provide funds and backing to solve problems which are essentially those of New York City.

REGIONAL APPROACH

New York has done a disservice to her neighbors and the New Haven by emphasizing the commuter aspects of the New Haven. Not just New York and Connecticut but Rhode Island and Massachusetts—and Maine and New Jersey, too—are concerned with the flow of goods and people which the New Haven can and should strengthen. The whole northeast corner of

March 11, 1965

the country will be made anemic if these vital arteries of travel and commerce are allowed to disintegrate or to bypass us. With increasing congestion over the decades ahead, our loss will become geometrically more serious.

The long-term solution of New Haven's problems, and the long-term health of New England and New York, depend on the creation of a cooperative agency or authority including at least the four States served by the New Haven. It should be a supraplata agency, quasi-public in nature, empowered to own and operate the railroad and to sell bonds to the public to finance the purchase and improvements, these bonds to be underwritten by Federal funds. The States and Washington should undertake to underwrite operating deficits on a fair formula for a temporary transition period only. The Port Authority of New York could serve to some extent as a model.

Such an authority could, as part of its plan, sell the freight operation, or lease trackage and equipment to one or another railroad. It could undertake the expensive modernization and improvement program which alone will enable the railroad to compete with other methods of transportation. With money and imaginative management it could stand a good chance of making the New Haven again New England's main artery—and a profitable one.

This is the direction in which our legislators and officials in Hartford and Washington must turn if they are to rescue the New Haven. This is the package of temporary subsidy plus long-term planning which they must put together for the good of the railroad and even more for the good of the States it serves.

The War in Vietnam—XIII

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI
OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 11, 1965

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Lucian C. Warren, Washington correspondent for the Courier-Express, Buffalo, N.Y., has been writing a report on Vietnam for his newspaper. Under unanimous consent, I include part XIII of this series which appeared in the Courier-Express on March 5, 1965:

THE WAR IN VIETNAM, XIII—STABLE GOVERNMENT IS KEY TO VICTORY

(NOTE.—Lucian C. Warren, Washington correspondent for The Courier-Express, after a visit to the combat zones in South Vietnam gives a closeup look at the war there which has left him with decided convictions about U.S. political strategy in that far-off unhappy land.)

(By Lucian C. Warren)

SAIGON, SOUTH VIETNAM.—It is popular here and elsewhere to be critical of the way the war against the Vietcong Communists is being run.

Hugh Campbell, for 2 years a Canadian delegate on the three-nation International Control Commission that has tried unsuccessfully to make the 1954 Vietnam partition agreement work, is openly scornful of the American military effort. In a recent article he even took out after the average serviceman's wife in Saigon, saying that "she takes the fur-lined mug" for "boorishness, offensiveness and condescension toward her 'inferiors,'" meaning the South Vietnamese.

In Congress, rarely a day goes by that some Senator, such as Senator WAYNE MORSE or

Senator RICHARD RUESELL, doesn't grab a headline by saying, "we're fighting the wrong war at the wrong time and had best negotiate some deal with the North Vietnamese."

CRITICISM

The constant barrage of criticism had reminded one briefing officer here of what Titus Livius (Livy), who died in A.D. 17, recorded in his history of Rome volume 7, about a Roman consul's attitude toward his armchair military critics.

According to Livy, Lucius Aemilius Paulus, who conducted the war against the Macedonians in 168 B.C., sarcastically commented that in every circle and, truly, at every table, there are people who lead armies into Macedonia, who know where the camps ought to be placed, when and through what pass that territory should be entered, when it is proper to engage the enemy and when to lie quiet.

OPPORTUNITY

The Roman consul ended his diatribe by suggesting that if anyone was well qualified to give advice on the Macedonia war, let him come to Macedonia at public expense, where he shall be furnished with a ship, a horse, a tent—even his traveling charges shall be defrayed.

But, Lucius Paulus concluded, according to Livy, if he thinks this too much trouble, and prefers the repose of city life to the tolls of war, let him not, on land, assume the office of a pilot.

In other words, this was the angered put-up-or-shut-up attitude of a criticism-stung general 2,000 years ago.

The observations: Any war that is taking a toll in casualties among the enemy in the ratio of nearly 3 to 1 of the United States-South Vietnamese forces is not a failure. It can and should be higher if the right side is to win eventually, but the United States and its ally are learning much about guerrilla warfare and captured Vietcong documents and prisoners show recognition that they are up against tough adversaries.

As to the Campbell criticism of servicemen's wives, we share with Buffalo's Maj. Gen. Richard G. Stilwell, Army Chief of Staff here, resentment at an unfair comment. Mrs. Stilwell herself until her recent departure worked as a Gray Lady in the local hospital and as a volunteer helper in an orphanage.

DEDICATED

"The wives of career officers, be they embassy or military, are every bit as dedicated and hard working as their spouses," says Stilwell, and I'm sure he's right.

The war is by no means won or nearly won and our forces on the scene would be the first to admit this. In fact, there is general acknowledgement that even within the last year the Vietcong have gained in both population and area under their control.

And the ratio of the enemy's casualties to ours is dwindling from 4.3 to 1 in 1962, to 3.7 to 1 in 1963, to 2.4 to 1 in 1964. Furthermore, the enemy's weapons are becoming more sophisticated every day. The day of handmade weapons among the Vietcong seems to be over, and these days the Vietcong are being supplied with some of the best Chinese and Russian military weapons available, including 60- and 80-pound mortars and 59-millimeter cannons.

IMPROVING

Meanwhile our weaponry is improving, too, but notwithstanding the fact that the United States-Vietnamese forces have total air superiority over the enemy, the war on the ground is a hard-fought, close contest.

And the U.S. casualties, while still small, are rising. Figures for a recent week's toll showed more than 200 U.S. killed or wounded, highest of any week in the war.

The political situation in South Vietnam is still unstable and the Government still weak. As this was written, a new civilian government had been in office only a few days

when the military started its favorite past-time of initiating coups.

The U.S. Embassy and soldiers here are guardedly optimistic, at least to the extent that the new Premier, Phan Huy Quat, foreign minister in a former government, is considered an able man and his cabinet shows a good balance in representation from various sections of the country and ethnic and political shadings.

ACCEPTABLE

The new civilian Government has been reported acceptable to Buddhist leader Tri Quang, whose displeasure has been a major factor in toppling earlier governments, including that of President Diem. But Tri Quang is unpredictable, is definitely neutralist in sentiment and thinks the United States should negotiate with North Vietnam.

If—and this is a big if—at long last Premier Quat is allowed by the military and Tri Quang to stay in office for a sufficient time to develop stability and strength, this will be reflected in a much stronger political front, against the dedicated Vietcong.

This is the hope both of intelligent South Vietnamese and United States forces. Then when effective military action rolls back the Vietcong, strong local governments can be formed under direction from Saigon to keep the acquired territory safe for democratic government.

BOMBING

Along with a strong and stable civilian government, U.S. bombing of North Vietnam must continue, whether under the pretext of retaliation for Vietcong attacks or in support of outright military goals.

From the U.S. Ambassador down, top ranking U.S. civil and military officials bend over backward not to criticize past U.S. hesitancy on this score, but once in a while a remark like "it should have been started 2 years ago" slips out. And all the military analyses of eventual victory hint broadly that continued bombings of North Vietnam territory are a part of the recipe for triumph.

It is unthinkable that the United States should pull out, nor can it be a party to any negotiated truce that will let the Vietcong takeover as soon as U.S. forces are removed. Perhaps, if the United States and South Vietnam get stronger in a combined military political way and if the toll becomes increasingly hard for Hanoi to bear, then it is possible negotiations from strength might produce a settlement with sufficient safeguards to maintain a democratic government in South Vietnam.

WATCHING

But until that time, the war must go on. The world is watching to see whether the United States is the paper tiger the Communist claim. If it becomes convinced, then it will be Indonesia, and Thailand, perhaps Malaysia, to fall next. Communist takeovers in Africa and Latin America would be encouraged.

A defeat for the Vietcong would immensely simplify the problem of the free world. Victory is possible with stronger U.S. military and South Vietnamese political offensives. It may take 5 to 10 years, but when the stakes are so high, there is no substitute for victory.

Legislative Program of the Veterans of Foreign Wars

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE
OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 9, 1965

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, March 9, 1965, the Com-

within the past weeks. The President of the United States promised Martin Luther King that the voting bill he wanted passed would be sent to the Congress and even now, members of both political parties are drafting legislation. The demands of the leaders of the so-called civil rights movement have been met and are being met. So why the demonstrations? Why the resort to anarchy?

A month ago I appealed to the President and to the Members of this body to use whatever influence they had to bring a halt to these demonstrations and return to the rule of law and order. I warned them that continued defiance of the law could only lead to tragedy and it has. I am sorry for it. Now we must bring an end to these disorders and we must demand that all people obey the law of the land. To make exceptions, for whatever excuse, can only lead to further anarchy, further violence, further tragedy.

In a column in the Washington Evening Star of Wednesday, March 10, David Lawrence makes an eloquent case for bringing about a return to law and order. I include this column as a part of these remarks:

THE LAW OF THE LAND TODAY
(By David Lawrence)

Once upon a time the Supreme Court of the United States affirmed that "freedom of speech" does not include the right to cry "Fire" in a crowded theater.

Today the principle is being tested in Alabama, where the right to demonstrate has been insisted upon even in the face of the fact that street parades in a tense situation can incite to violence.

Plainly there is among the people a lack of understanding of fundamental constitutional principles. These give every citizen the right to express himself freely, though his views may be unpalatable to others, but the moment the actual utterance of such views occurs under conditions that inflame people to violence, the law steps in and applies a restraining hand.

After a Federal judge had issued a ruling yesterday ordering the parade from Selma to Montgomery to be deferred at least until Thursday, when a hearing would be held on the subject, the demonstrators insisted on going ahead anyhow in defiance of the court order.

Yet these same demonstrators argue that they are being deprived of their civil rights, and they evidently feel this gives them unlimited privilege to disturb the peace. When the police attempted a few days ago to break up the mob in Selma and took stern measures to do so, the officers were charged with brutality. Accusations were then voiced on the floor of Congress against the police, and demands were made for this dispatch of Federal troops to Alabama. Most of those who spoke on the subject ignored the fundamental fact that the right to demonstrate does not include the right to incite anybody to violence.

But Attorney General Nicholas deB. Katzenbach, in a question-and-answer period after a speech at the Women's National Press Club yesterday, rightly explained that the Federal Government does not have the constitutional power to send troops into any State unless there is a "total breakdown" of law and order and a "total unwillingness" by State officials to maintain order. He said that the primary responsibility for keeping the peace rests with the local authorities.

In the instances when the Kennedy administration sent troops to Alabama and

Mississippi, the respective Governors of those States were at least accused of having defied Federal court orders on school integration. In the present case, the Governor of the State warned against the march from Selma to Montgomery and sent State troopers to the scene to prevent disorder.

Basically, the Governor of Alabama was taking the same position President Kennedy took when he sent troops to restrain potential violence and enforce a Federal court order. The purpose of the Alabama Governor was to prevent violence, and he had urged that the march on Montgomery be abandoned for the time being as a measure of safety.

Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., on the other hand, insisted upon leading the demonstrators for a brief march notwithstanding a Federal judge's order that it be deferred until the case went through the normal judicial process. The presence of State troopers prevented any disturbance of the peace yesterday. The Negro leader, in authorizing the march, said:

"We have the right to walk the highways; we have the right to walk to Montgomery if our feet will get us there. I have no alternative, and I ask you to come with me. This was a difficult and painful decision to make. I know not what lies ahead. There may be beatings, and there may be tear gas."

But it is precisely the incitement to a situation requiring such measures that always has been recognized as being within the province of State or city police to deal with, even to the point of dispersing a nonviolent demonstration that has proved dangerous to the peace of the community.

President Johnson issued a statement regretting the violence that occurred in Selma on Sunday. He declared that "Americans everywhere join in deploring the brutality with which a number of Negro citizens of Alabama were treated when they sought to dramatize their deep and sincere interest in attaining the precious right to vote."

But the President guardedly omitted any criticism of the acts of the demonstrators who defied the police and caused the latter to use force. While Johnson defended the right to demonstrate, he failed to express any concern over the kind of disturbances of the peace that can and often do result from street demonstrations.

Many of the pressure groups claim that they are engaged in nonviolent demonstrations. But, while this may be their intent and objective, their manner of conducting demonstrations often leads to violence. The States have a constitutional right and obligation then to step in and order the dispersal of the demonstrators. This is the true law of the land today.

Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 11, 1965

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, the New York Times published an editorial on March 10, 1965, regarding the reaction to Secretary General Thant's suggestion about negotiations in Vietnam. The Times observes, "This futile game of diplomatic chess thus remains in stalemate while the war itself escalates." I recommend that my colleagues read the following editorial from the New York Times:

[From the New York Times, Mar. 10, 1965]

A NEGOTIATION IS A NEGOTIATION

The words were hardly out of Secretary General Thant's mouth when the United States rejected his proposal. He had recommended a seven-power conference on the Vietnamese conflict.

The State Department spokesman gave the same old reply. "We still await some indication that the aggressors are prepared to talk about stopping the aggression," he said, adding that Washington would require advance evidence that negotiations would produce an agreement acceptable to the United States in Vietnam. In other words, the United States will negotiate if our terms are accepted before negotiations begin. So why negotiate?

This futile game of diplomatic chess thus remains in stalemate while the war itself escalates. Yet all wars, including the Vietnamese type, must end in some form of parley. The questions are when and how? President Johnson and his chief advisers believe the time is not ripe and that present circumstances find the United States—strong as it is—in an unfavorable position. American policy therefore is to improve the position and then consider negotiation from a vantage point where terms can be extracted to fit American demands.

On both sides the game is being played as if it can be won or lost. In reality, there can be no "victory" except at a shattering cost in lives and treasure.

President Kennedy put the problem accurately in a speech he made on September 2, 1963. "In the final analysis," he said, "it is their [the South Vietnamese] war. They are the ones who have to win it or lose it. We can help them; we can give them equipment; we can send our men out there as advisers, but they have to win it—the people of Vietnam—against the Communists."

President Johnson, on the contrary, has now changed this policy and is trying to win the war with American arms and American forces on behalf of the South Vietnamese. This is impossible because, as Mr. Kennedy said, "It is their war"—although it is of course also true that the North Vietnamese are supplying increasing help to one side, as the United States is to the other.

The conference that Secretary Thant has recommended may or may not be an answer. It certainly deserves a more sympathetic exploration than it is getting from Washington.

There must be many Congressmen who are unhappy but reluctant to say so, and many, if not most, of the American people who would surely opt for negotiation if the issues—all the issues—were made clear to them. The American public has not been sufficiently informed and it cannot be until President Johnson speaks to the Nation.

No one can ask that he tell exactly what he plans to do, or that he divulge military secrets, or say just what terms would be acceptable, but when the President does not speak the people lack leadership. They have become confused while the Vietnamese conflict has become crucial and dangerous.

Flood Damage Report for County Hits \$5,597,426

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. AL ULLMAN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 8, 1965

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, the record of damages to the Northwest continues to be compiled as Oregon and the

A1132

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

March 11, 1965

other States, involved in the record December-January flood, work toward completion of assessment and plans for rehabilitation.

Currently the Subcommittee on Flood Control, Committee on Public Works, is considering means of legislative relief for our disaster stricken part of the Nation. It is altogether timely, therefore, to include in the Record the latest damage assessment of only 1 of the 18 counties in my Second District of Oregon. This report of Grant County damages was ably reported in the Blue Mountain Eagle:

[From the Blue Mountain Eagle, John Day, Oreg., Feb. 25, 1965]

FLOOD DAMAGE REPORT FOR COUNTY HITS \$5,597,426

Damages caused by the recent floods total \$5,597,426 for Grant County. River and agriculture repair costs and flood loss amounts to \$4,879,547.

Home damage in Grant County is \$222,372.90; business damage stands at \$557,069. Damages represents nearly one-tenth of the true cash value of \$60,727,124 for the county.

The cash value of the county will be less for the next fiscal year due to the flood loss, says James Allen, county assessor. Reduced livestock valuation and the loss of two mills in Mount Vernon will lower the cash value of Grant County for next year.

An extensive survey compiled by Tom Bunch, county agent at large, revealed heaviest damages were inflicted on the streambanks of the John Day River and its tributaries. An estimated \$2,413,256 is needed for new work for the streams. So far, \$15,365 has been spent on channel work.

The report has been used to acquire additional Office of Emergency Planning (OEP) and Agriculture Conservation Program (ACP) funds.

Replacing the washed out riprap and levees that were installed prior to the recent flood will cost \$165,740. To repair damaged levees and dikes, to clean debris from the river and to reshape the channels will cost at least \$628,829.

Land eroded away or damaged by sheet erosion was valued at \$249,053. To fill in the newly created gulys across fields will cost \$29,048.

Another \$217,440 will be needed to clean up debris and to smooth out the silt and gravel deposits on the crop lands.

Cost to replace and rebuild washed-out private irrigation ditches is \$29,894. To clean the ditches that are repairable will cost \$59,888.

Company ditches damage figure is estimated at \$100,000 to replace destroyed ditches and to repair damaged ditches.

Work needed to meet the potential weed infestation in areas covered with silt or gravel deposits or that have been scoured will cost \$185,000. This is the latest estimate as many people did not report potential weed infestation on their land.

Stock water damage report may be low but the report indicates that it will cost \$1,590 to replace irrigation and stock water ponds. To clean up and repair the ponds will cost \$21,591.

Damage to private roads will cost \$23,471 to repair. Replacement cost of the washed-out roads is estimated at \$7,237.

A total of \$165,099 is necessary to replace private bridges in Grant County. An additional \$63,251 is needed to repair the partially damaged bridges and to reshape crossings. As of last week when the damage reports were filed \$4,490 was already spent on bridge repair. Part of this figure includes work done following the Christmas flood.

The cost to replace washed-out bridges was calculated at \$6 per square foot.

An estimated \$15,440 worth of livestock was lost in the flood in the county.

It will cost \$19,260 to replace destroyed buildings and another \$11,777 to repair the damaged structures.

Machinery lost during the flood or rendered useless because of water damage totals \$5,035. Repairing damaged machinery will cost \$3,953. As of a week ago \$170 has been spent on machinery repairs.

To replace washed-out fences in the county, \$47,828 is needed. Another \$28,332 is required for repair work. So far only \$150 has been spent on fence repairs.

The estimated crop loss for Grant County totals \$235,846. Hay lost is reported at \$119,322. This estimated crop loss and loss of aftermath grazing and permanent pasture is for 1965 only. Hay loss was figured at \$30 per ton and grazing loss at \$4.50 per animal unit per month. Nearly 4,000 tons of hay was lost during the flood.

Inconvenience cost amounted to \$71,499. This cost is associated with flood fighting, loss of livestock weight, housing and feeding people during the flood and general inconvenience associated with or because of the flood. Most people would not put a dollar value on this type of an item for the report.

Loss of supplies such as lumber, fence posts, spools of wire, and firewood was estimated at \$27,873.

Bunch, former assistant county agent for Grant County, and who has recently completed his masters degree requirements at Oregon State University, headed the damage report project. Ray Brisbois handled much of the home and business damage survey.

The county agent at large made up the report forms and arranged the numerous meetings throughout the county to help ranchers to complete the reports.

County agent Bill Farrell served as a coordinator between the project report and the county Emergency Action Committee (EAC). The EAC was headed by cochairmen C. L. (Buck) Smith and Jim Maple. Larry Williams was also active in the project.

Heading the subcommittees of the EAC were: Erving Stanbro of Prairie City; Bob Sproul of Mount Vernon; Alvin Brown of Daytonville; Joe Officer of Izee; Rho Bleakman of Monument, and Tom Colvin of Ritter.

Another Citizen Does His Duty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN B. ANDERSON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 11, 1965

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call the Members' attention to an editorial which appeared in the Rockford Morning Star, Rockford, Ill., on July 26, 1964. This editorial was written by Hal Nelson, associate editor of the Rockford Morning Star, who was just named as the recipient of a Freedoms Foundation medal.

In recent weeks we have heard several reports of witnesses refusing to become involved in arrests because of the "inconveniences" that might result for themselves. Thus this story of a citizen going out of his way to aid in the arrest and conviction of persons involved in a robbery even though it meant considerable expense and personal hardship affords a lesson for all who consider themselves good citizens.

ANOTHER CITIZEN DOES HIS DUTY

(By Hal Nelson)

Almost a year ago, on August 10, 1963, Joe Nash's curiosity was aroused by suspicious actions of a man in a telephone booth on Seventh Street.

The next morning, when he saw newspaper stories about two Indianapolis men arrested on charges of robbing a North Second Street phone booth, Joe realized that one of the suspects might have been the man he had seen on Seventh Street.

Joe was in Rockford at the time on a vacation from Mexico City where he is travel editor of the English-language Mexico City News.

It would have been easy for Joe to have decided that the arrest of the two men with \$2,376 in nickels, dimes, and quarters in their Indiana-licensed car was none of his business. In these days of apathy and fear of involvement in police matters, many a good citizen would have taken this course.

But Joe has a strongly developed sense of citizen responsibility. Rockford remains his hometown, his legal residence even though he has worked in Mexico City for many years.

He felt he should report what he had seen to police. He made a positive identification of one of the suspects, gave police a statement, promised the State attorney's staff that he would return to testify if needed.

The two suspects were indicted. A trial date was set. Joe arranged to leave his job in Mexico City long enough to fly to Rockford to testify. But he learned the trial had been delayed when he arrived here. Another trial date was set. Before he could be notified, Joe had left on a 2-week trip into sections of Mexico where primitive communication made it impossible to reach him.

The case finally came to trial last week. Joe had extended his vacation 3 days in order to testify. He told his story in circuit court after spending hours in the stifling witness room.

Defense attorneys objected to Nash's testimony—and the judge ordered most of it stricken.

The jury deliberated 6 hours; then returned a verdict of guilty.

Was it worthwhile, this expenditure of time, effort, nerve energy on the part of a private citizen in a matter which did not personally concern him in anyway?

We didn't ask Joe this question. His actions revealed his answer.

But what about the rest of us? Would we have done it?

That's a question we all should ask ourselves. It's much easier to close our eyes and ears and stay out of such matters.

Yet, if we want to live in a country of law and order, of freedom from fear, of liberty to move about without restraint, it's time that more of us follow the course that Joe did.

Selma Now Joins List Headed by Little Rock

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WESTON E. VIVIAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 11, 1965

Mr. VIVIAN. Mr. Speaker, we have all been dismayed and shocked by the barbaric attack upon peaceful demonstrators in Alabama on Sunday. Sunday's brutality poses a threat to all Americans. I wish to bring to the attention of the Members, the comments of the editors of a newspaper in my district—the Ann

sequences of it are a matter of deep concern. May I just say that, for very personal reasons, I am happy that it was not in effect at the turn of the century. For perhaps if it were, two young people from Eastern Europe might not have been able to come to this country, settle here, marry and raise eight children to enjoy America's blessings and in some measure, I trust, bring credit to her good name.

Immigration is a matter of law—of natural law and positive law. Just as the Constitution gives expression to the natural rights of man; so also should the immigration law be in accord with the inalienable human right of migration. It is within the framework of law that the phenomenon of immigration has to take place. If the law is not flexible enough to allow the problems of immigration to be faced on the human level in a just and compassionate way, then the law should be modified.

But immigration is not only a matter of law; it is far more poignantly a matter of people. The most direct problems that are faced are neither political nor technical; but questions which the human and social actually pose. As Pope John said elsewhere in *Pacem in Terris*:

"The sentiment of universal fatherhood which the Lord has placed in our heart makes us feel profound sadness in considering the phenomenon of political refugees, a phenomenon which has assumed large proportions and which always hides numberless acute sufferings."

We may say the same regarding all persons who have been uprooted, who have to be resettled and readjusted to a new way of life. This pastoral solicitude accounts for the efforts of the Catholic Church to form and maintain national parishes to meet the needs of immigrant peoples. These parishes enable these people to preserve and strengthen their religious life and customs, and to enjoy the great consolation of worshiping and confessing in their mother tongue. They have provided in the course of time for the transition of the children of these people into the more general American way of life which has thereby been greatly enriched.

The physical, psychological and spiritual well-being of immigrants, whether voluntary or refugees, should concern all of us. Experience has shown that even so human a thing as having a familiar meal may be a matter of great importance to a recent arrival. Far more important are his family ties, his manner of worship, his loneliness and heartaches of separation, and his feelings of inferiority.

Let us accept the reality of immigration and the responsibilities that it brings taking as our counsel the words of Isaiah the prophet (Isaiah 58: 7, 8):

"Share thy bread with the hungry, and bring the needy and the harborless into thy house. When thou shalt see one naked, cover him and despise not thy own flesh. Then shall thy light break forth as the morning . . . and thy justice shall go before thy face and the glory of the Lord shall gather thee up."

Protection of Voting Rights

SPEECH
OF

HON. ROY H. McVICKER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 9, 1965

Mr. McVICKER. Mr. Speaker, the news of the past few days in Selma, Ala., where police have beaten, mauled, and

gassed unarmed and unoffending citizens has been a cause for grave alarm for our Nation. Had it not just happened, it would be unthinkable in this day and age that police who have sworn to uphold the law and protect the citizenry could turn on them with a violent attack.

The right of citizens to assemble peacefully and to petition their elected officials for redress of their grievances is as old as free government and as plain as the Constitution. The State of Alabama has the responsibility to protect its citizens, both Negro and white, in the exercise of that right.

But Gov. George C. Wallace has instead chosen to meet peaceful protest with armed force, and by so doing has brought shame to his State and to our Nation.

With the enactment of the civil rights law of 1964, the perpetrators of bigotry and discrimination should have recognized the end of a shameful era and the beginning of a new era in which all citizens shall enjoy the rights and privileges granted them under the Constitution. The consensus of responsible Americans is denouncing racial prejudice; the clergy who went to Selma and the white citizens of Alabama who protested the recent infamous events speak for the great majority, who will no longer tolerate discrimination and violence.

Unless the State of Alabama recognizes that the tide is turning against bigotry, and unless the Negroes living in Alabama be given their right to vote, then there is no other course of action left to the Congress but to enact strong voting rights legislation, providing for whatever is necessary to insure that Negroes be given the unqualified right to vote. And I hasten to add that I would be a strong supporter of this action.

Selma Demonstrations Proceeding According to Blueprint

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JAMES D. MARTIN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 25, 1965

Mr. MARTIN of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, no right thinking American can be happy with what is going on in Selma, Ala.

We are witnessing a complete breakdown of law and order. We witnessed open defiance of a Federal court order and total disregard of a plea by the President of the United States to halt further marches. For what? To gain the right to vote for Negroes?

I am sorry to say, Mr. Speaker, this is not the objective of the Selma demonstrations and never has been the objective. Before these demonstrations ever started, Negroes in Alabama had the right to vote. The registrars of the city of Selma were making every effort to comply with the voting provisions of the civil rights law which Congress passed so overwhelmingly last year. The increase in Negro registrations in Selma and

throughout Alabama almost without exception compared most favorably with the increase in Negro registrations in other sections of the Nation including New York, Michigan, and California.

What then is the purpose of these continuing demonstrations in Selma? The purpose was well set out and a blueprint drawn for the demonstrations, a blueprint which included plans to provoke the arrest of the civil rights leader and to incite violence. The purpose was to arouse public opinion in support of a Federal election law. The blueprint was set forth in the National Observer of last Monday, March 8, and I include the article at this point as a part of these remarks:

A CHANGE IN TACTICS: A MASTER PLAN GUIDES NEGROES IN ALABAMA, SETS NEXT MOVES

Leaders of the Negro voting drive in Alabama are nearing a decision on whether to employ their most dramatic strategy: An all-Negro election of legislators to challenge the seating of the State's regularly elected lawmakers.

The strategy is embodied in an elaborate blueprint, titled project for Alabama, that was drawn up last year. A copy of the document obtained by the National Observer shows that the current voter-registration drive in Selma and nearby communities is following the blueprint closely.

The election strategy calls for Negroes to challenge the seating of white legislators when the legislature convenes May 4.

THE NEGRO STRATEGY

The idea is to rally the State's Negroes—most of them are not registered to vote in Alabama's official elections—for a Negro-sponsored election. Civil rights leaders hope enough Negroes would vote to give each legislator they choose more votes unofficially than the regularly elected legislator got in the same district. Rights leaders would then argue that the regularly elected legislators were not duly elected because Negroes, who could have outvoted the registered voters, were denied the ballot.

The blueprint specifies that "quotas that must be met should be set for each district with the idea of topping the number of votes gotten by the white representative or senator in that district." The blueprint calls this the freedom vote campaign.

If the legislators elected by Negroes are not seated, the blueprint declares that "demonstrations should ensue until legislators elected by the freedom vote attain their rightful seats, or until people can freely register."

Thus the Reverend Martin Luther King, Jr., and those leading the voter-registration campaign with him would introduce a new tactic in the racial struggle. The Reverend James Bevel, director of the Alabama project for Dr. King's Southern Christian Leadership Conference, acknowledges the plan. But he told the National Observer that if Congress passes legislation now being drafted to remove barriers to Negro registration and voting, the freedom vote plan may not be used.

CONFERENCE IN WASHINGTON

Dr. King was in Washington at week's end to discuss the proposed legislation with President Johnson. Before the meeting, the White House announced that the legislation is "still being checked out" by the Justice Department before the President sends it to Congress in a special message.

The legislation is expected to place a moratorium on the use of literacy tests and provide, as a last resort, Federal registrars to register Negroes where local officials won't.

Such a bill has a good chance in Congress. RUSSELL LONG, the Democrat's assistant floor leader in the Senate and a southerner him-

A1138

self (Louisiana), indicates he'll support new voting legislation. And EVERETT DIRKSEN, of Illinois, Republican Senate leader, declares his support. True, a Senate filibuster by southerners still is possible; the Senate Rules Committee in a 5-to-4 vote last week, defeated a proposal to make it easier to cut off Senate debate. Presently, a two-thirds majority vote is required to shut off Senate debate.

Alabama civil rights leaders are eager for assurance on the legislation. There is little time remaining before May 4 to get candidates picked and the freedom vote machinery in operation, should they go ahead with the plan. The blueprint calls for a state convention of Alabama Negroes to select candidates. Then posters and handbills are to be distributed advertising the candidates, 10,000 "Freedom Army Handbooks" are to be distributed, and Negroes are to be registered for the unofficial vote.

HEADQUARTERS IN MONTGOMERY

The project would be coordinated through a project office in Montgomery. The office would dispense money, cars, and buses, registration forms, press releases, and campaign materials for the freedom vote.

It also would provide speakers and formats for mass meetings. In addition, according to the blueprint: "All legal and medical help can be secured through the project office; this includes bonds, payment of fines caused by harassment, and doctor bills."

Harassment not only is expected; it is counted upon in the project for Alabama blueprint. The freedom vote section of the document is preceded by a freedom registration section, outlining the part of the overall movement that has been underway in the Selma area. "Arrests should continue over months," says the blueprint, "to create interest in the freedom registration and freedom vote." The plan specifies that "arrests and violence should be interpreted as an abridgment of freedoms fought for and won in the Revolutionary War, but able to exist today because officials are not responsible to citizens of the State, those citizens not having the right to equal representation or the right to vote."

ARREST ACCORDING TO PLAN

The blueprint even includes the assumption that Dr. King would be jailed—as he was. The blueprint declares: "After Dr. King is in jail, a letter dealing with bombings, violence, not being represented, etc., should be widely distributed to Negroes in Alabama (letter from the Selma jail). At the proper time, the advisory board and project leaders shall formally declare that the problems of Selma and other similar Black Belt areas will only be resolved when Negroes participate in the government of Alabama."

But Dr. King did not write the letter from the Selma jail. According to the Reverend Mr. Bevel, it and some other publicity plans contained in the blueprint, such as the purchase of newspaper ads in 21 heavily Negro counties, were dropped because the movement got better press coverage in Alabama than expected. Admits the Reverend Mr. Bevel: "Alabama newspapers have been very decent in reporting what is going on and defining our aims to the people." He mentioned the Birmingham News in particular. But he adds, "If the papers fail to clarify our positions or carry our statements, then we will have to do it (purchase ads)."

DECLARATION OF FREEDOM

Other parts of the blueprint, however, are being carried out as specified. The "Declaration of Freedom" that the blueprint says the advisory board should draft and present to Gov. George Wallace is ready. Negroes from throughout the State will go to the statehouse in Montgomery Wednesday to present the declaration, which will ask that Governor Wallace "Immediately remove all

barriers that keep Negroes from full participation in the government."

Also, the King-Douglass workshops provided for in the blueprint are being organized. This, the Reverend Mr. Bevel declares, will be the beginning of a "different movement" in the racial struggle. It will "combine the nonviolent philosophy of Dr. King with the political philosophy of Frederick Douglass" in preparing Negroes to lead integration activities in Alabama. Frederick Douglass was the escaped Negro slave who won historical fame in the Civil War and Reconstruction eras for his speaking and writing on behalf of the Abolitionist cause. His political philosophy, according to the Reverend Mr. Bevel, was that racial problems in the South never would be solved until Negroes had Federal protection.

A LACK OF LEADERS

A major hindrance in carrying out all of the blueprint has been a lack of sufficient numbers of trained leaders. The problem is the staff people we would use for some of these things are tied up with other things going on now," says the Reverend Mr. Bevel.

Leadership and organization called for in the blueprint are extensive. There are to be "precinct workers, block captains, and block workers" to rally Negro voters throughout the State. The blueprint calls for an "Operation Dialog," through which Negro leaders communicate "with the white communities, informing them of our frustrations and objectives in going to jail and conducting freedom registration." There is to be a speakers' bureau to conduct mass meetings "to make crystal clear the objectives of the statewide project." There are to be film showings and nonviolent workshops. Field offices are to be established. Maps showing Negro precinct divisions for the elections are to be prepared. A newspaper, the Alabama Citizen, is called for. A list of 22 key staff positions is in the blueprint, in addition to a special provision for 20 "volunteer workers that will receive \$10 a week."

BOYCOTT IDEA STUDIED

Much of this remains to be carried out, but it is being done. Six counties now have nonviolent training workshops; these eventually are to exist throughout the State. And research is underway on one of the most potentially effective weapons indicated in the blueprint: An economic boycott, aimed particularly at "new and expanding industries" in Alabama. The blueprint calls for "an analysis of the economic situation of Alabama * * * searching out the point where a boycott would be most devastating."

Some white leaders in Alabama have obtained copies of the blueprint, studied it, and cited it as evidence that there is nothing spontaneous about the Negro activities. But Negro leaders see such extensive organization as necessary for those activities to get results. Declares the blueprint unequivocally: "The Negroes of Alabama will be organized into a unit that can effectively carry out a statewide nonviolent campaign."

The blueprint was drawn up by Negro leaders last September immediately after a Negro church was bombed in Birmingham. The Reverend Mr. Bevel relates: "We asked ourselves, what can we do about Alabama?" The blueprint is their answer.

GERALD GEORGE.

The Vietnam White Paper

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 11, 1965

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, the New Republic magazine of March 13, 1965,

published an article on the State Department's white paper on Vietnam which deserves careful attention. The article follows:

THE WHITE PAPER

The best that can be said about the State Department's white paper on Vietnam is that it is entirely unconvincing. The worst is that it is contradictory, illogical, and misleading. It has a desperate purpose: to prepare the moral platform for widening the war. The bombs which United States and South Vietnamese attackers hurled at North Vietnam last week were probably being loaded as the white paper was distributed in Washington. Still, American sensibilities demand some small assurance that precipitous acts of war spring not from blind frustration but from considered judgment. The white paper attempts to prove that escalation is the only reasonable response to a war which is quite simply a case of flagrant aggression by North Vietnam.

Not even the North Vietnamese would deny that they have given the Communist Vietcong in the south some measure of military aid and moral support. It is hard enough to find a purely civil war in history, and increasingly in this century internal conflicts are attended by international kibitzers on all sides—in the Congo, the Yemen, and Cuba no less than in Vietnam. But the State Department is out to prove much more than meddling: North Vietnam, it says, "has used every resource of its own government to carry out its carefully planned program of concealed aggression. North Vietnam's commitment to seize control of the south is no less total (equally total? or more total?) than was the commitment of the regime in North Korea in 1950." Then begins a "summary of the massive evidence of North Vietnamese aggression," in 64 chart-filled and picture-padded pages.

All the State Department's Himalayan labor has brought forth a mouse of an argument. The first conclusion made is that North Vietnamese infiltrators make up the bulk of the Vietcong forces, and 19 cases are cited as proof, complete with photographs of the men, their military history and dramatic narrative, "Then the more than 300 men began walking to the south. * * * They marched by day, rested at night." But of the 19 infiltrators, 16 are South Vietnamese natives who were returning to their homeland, 1 is unidentified by place of birth, and only 2 are North Vietnamese. All were captured in either 1962 or 1963, although the white paper can't be that outdated; it contains other material about 3 weeks old. In a very short section which appears to be an afterthought, six more infiltrators of North Vietnamese origin are named, without photographs or military history. They provide the only evidence for the paper's contention that "as many as 75 percent of the more than 4,400 Vietcong who are known to have entered the South in the first 8 months of 1964 were natives of North Vietnam."

Figures are given to support the State Department's claim that infiltrators from the North—allowing for casualties—make up the majority of the so-called hard-core Vietcong. But the white paper conspicuously ignores its own advice; it does not allow for casualties among the 19,500 confirmed and 17,550 estimated infiltrators of the past 5 years. Allowing for the generally accepted Vietcong casualty rate of 50 percent, half of the infiltrators must be removed from battle each year. In the hard-core Vietcong force of 35,000 and the full army of 115,000, that leaves a current total of only 4,200 confirmed and perhaps 3,300 more estimated infiltrators—of whom perhaps fewer than half are native North Vietnamese.

But the State Department would have it both ways: even if careful readers of the white paper should discover that North Vietnamese aid the Vietcong in roughly the same

proportion that Americans aid the government troops, they are assured that mere numbers are unimportant. The infiltrators are as tough as tigers, and 10 feet tall. "The infiltration of 5,000 guerrilla fighters in a given year is the equivalent of marching perhaps 50,000 regular troops across the border," cautions the State Department. Though the Vietcong fights against all the State Department holds dear, neither napalm in the south nor bombs in the north seem to shake its determination. What the white paper does not explain is the stubborn courage and tenacity of the Vietcong of whatever provenance or hardness of core, year after year, for none of the usual rewards and against staggering odds of survival.

The second conclusion the white paper draws is that war materiel from North Vietnam and its Communist-bloc allies is pouring into the south. The paper is crowded with photographs of weapons, like a mail-order catalog, to bring home the full impact. But the long inventory of all Communist-made weapons captured from the Vietcong in an 18-month period from June 1962, to January 29, 1964, includes only 22 crew-served weapons (mortars, recoilless rifles, etc.) and 155 smaller arms, hardly enough to equip 1 of the 139 Vietcong companies. These weapons could have come from anywhere, including Alexandria, Va., where a private arms supplier lists almost all of the items mentioned. Communist weapons captured from the Egyptians by Israeli soldiers in 1956 turn up regularly on the open market, in enough quantities to allow any government to prove Communist involvement in the rebellion of its choice.

Before it became necessary to deny the existence of a civil war in South Vietnam, American military men admitted that about 80 percent of the Vietcong's weapons were unwittingly supplied by the United States by loss, theft, or sale by enterprising South Vietnamese. It now appears that the experts were wrong; if only 177 foreign weapons could be found in Vietcong hands in 18 months, the enemy must be 99 percent equipped with American materiel. Obviously no believable case for a claim of massive arms infiltration could be built on the official list in the white paper, even stretched as it is by the inclusion of every bullet, messkit, and pair of socks. And so, quite providentially, a larger supply of infiltrated arms was found in a sunken North Vietnamese junk in a southern harbor, just as the white paper was being prepared. In the annals of mystery ships, this one poses a fine puzzle. Perhaps the combined United States and South Vietnamese naval patrols are more inefficient than is usually conceded, but the ship was the first encountered in the history of the war. In any case, it hardly merits the full-throated treatment afforded by the white paper. The ship was about the size of a Coast Guard cutter, or slightly larger than the original *Santa Maria*, carrying about one-seventieth of the tonnage of a standard World War II Liberty ship. In relation to the amount of arms supplied regularly to the South Vietnamese by the United States, its supply was insignificant.

The white paper fails to sustain its two major contentions, that there is a large, militarily crucial infiltration of both men and materiel from Hanoi. It also fails to make its political points. The State Department claims that hostilities in South Vietnam began in 1959, as "a brutal campaign of terror and armed attack inspired, directed, supplied, and controlled by the Communist regime in Hanoi." But it was the late President Diem's abolition of the elected village councils in 1956 which made South Vietnam a true dictatorship and alienated a sizable proportion of the population. In response, the rebellion began early in 1957. It is still an ugly war. According to the white paper,

the Vietcong killed 1,359 civilians last year. According to our allies the South Vietnamese, and not reported in the white paper, the United States kills about 20,000 villagers and volunteers every year, largely by napalm bombing. The white paper cites as evidence of North Vietnamese involvement a report of the International Control Commission for Vietnam, which criticized Hanoi's activities in June 1962. The paper does not include item 20 of the Commission's report, however, which charges both the United States and South Vietnam with violating the 1954 Geneva Agreement on Indochina. Nor does it mention the Commission's reported criticism on February 13 of American attacks on North Vietnam, which were called unjustified. The paper destroys all credibility when it selects those findings of the Commission which seem to help its case, and then ignores those which contradict it.

To misunderstand the war in Vietnam is to condemn the United States to dishonor, defeat, or worse. The white paper repeats the misunderstandings of the last 6 years, and compounds them with deception. It is no good pretending that there is no civil war in progress in South Vietnam, and that the whole bloody business would end if North Vietnam would "leave its neighbor alone." There is no point in maintaining the fiction that the United States is involved "at the request of the people of South Vietnam," as the white paper does. There is no democratic way for the people of South Vietnam to express themselves—Diem and his successors have seen to that. If asked, and they will not be, the people of South Vietnam would doubtless want to send everyone away, Americans, Vietcong regulars, and North Vietnamese. The white paper says that this war is not like any others; that is true, and banal. Like all of the guerrilla wars of our generation, this one cannot be settled one way or the other by military action. The white paper cannot change a complex political conflict into a simple case of aggression over a border.

Mayor Robert F. Wagner Discusses the Problems of Urban Renewal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH L. CAREY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 11, 1965

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, few problems presently confronting the country exceed in seriousness and importance those that must be dealt with and solved in the area of urban renewal.

To some extent, every metropolitan area in the United States is faced with challenges of a rising population and industrial development. New York City is confronted with a highly unique problem in that it is one of the few major cities in the country where the movement of middle-class families back to metropolitan area exceeds the counter immigration toward the outlying suburbs. The problems we face, therefore, require immediate and effective solutions.

The office of the mayor of New York has frequently been characterized as carrying responsibilities second only to those of the President of the United States. Certainly, in the area of urban renewal, no public official is better qualified to speak with authority than the mayor of our city.

Mr. Speaker, on March 5, the Honorable Robert F. Wagner, mayor of the city of New York gave an address at the Third Annual Intercollegiate Urban Affairs Conference at Long Island University in which he discussed urban renewal problems in New York and other cities and some of the solutions required to meet present and future challenges.

I include the mayor's remarks below so that everyone concerned with urban renewal may benefit from his wisdom and insight into the subject:

REMARKS BY MAYOR ROBERT F. WAGNER AT LONG ISLAND UNIVERSITY—THIRD ANNUAL INTERCOLLEGIATE URBAN AFFAIRS CONFERENCE

Not so long ago cities were considered the proudest product of civilization. They were, in fact, its birthplace. In ancient times, Babylon, Alexandria, Jerusalem, Athens, Rome, and in later times, Constantinople, Paris, London, Budapest, Warsaw, and finally, San Francisco and New York were jewels in the crown of civilization.

A hundred years ago, the American theologian, Theodore Parker, wrote: "Cities have always been fireplaces of civilization, whence light and heat radiated out into the dark, cold world."

James Guthrie, the Scottish theologian, wrote: "I bless God for cities. They have been His lamps of life along the pathways of humanity and religion. Within them science has given birth to her noblest discoveries. Behind their walls freedom has fought her noblest battles. They have stood on the surface of the earth like great breakwaters rolling back or turning aside the swelling tide of oppression. Cities, indeed, have been the cradles of human liberty."

In recent years however, cities have become the chief problem and challenge of civilization. The question today is, can they survive the problems of their populations?

Almost all cities are faced with critical problems today. This is not only a nationwide, but also a worldwide, phenomenon.

Within the past 20 years millions of people have streamed into the cities from the countryside and villages. In the Western countries, hundreds of thousands of people have simultaneously moved out of the cities into the suburbs. The people moving into the cities have been, for the most part, the poor and the largely dispossessed. Those moving out of the cities have been the emerging and the emergent middle class.

This phenomenon has occurred and is occurring on every continent, in every latitude. As a matter of fact, it has been proceeding at a greater rate in Japan and the Soviet Union, for instance, than anywhere in Western Europe or North America.

In the first 50 years of this century, the total population living in Asian cities of 100,000 or more increased from 19.4 million to 105.6 million, a gain of 444 percent. In Africa, the population living in cities of 100,000 or more increased from 1.1 million to 10.2 million, a gain of 827 percent.

Only 50 years ago, in the United States, 50 percent of the people lived in cities. Today that figure is creeping toward 80 percent. By 1980, only 15 years from now, it is reliably estimated that 90 percent of all the inhabitants of the United States will be living in urban areas.

Turning again to the worldwide urbanized picture, the projection is that during the 1960's, 200 million people will move into the cities of Asia, Africa, and Latin America. The rate of urban growth in Asia today is 400 percent higher than in the West, and the movement to the cities there is only beginning.

What do all these figures mean for us in the United States, and especially for us here in New York City?

They mean that the United States has been touched by a worldwide tidal wave of

A1140

population movement, impelled by worldwide forces.

Professor Banfield, of Harvard, one of the most provocative of our present-day thinkers on the subject of urbanization, has suggested that the movement of poor people into the central cities has been due to the availability of housing abandoned by the exodus of middle-class families into the suburbs. I seriously question the order in this causal relationship.

As a matter of fact, I have read many explanations of the worldwide population movement, but we can overlook for the moment why it happened. It has happened.

In New York City, the crest of both the outgoing and the incoming movement seems to have passed. By building more and more Government-subsidized middle-income housing at reasonable rates, we are inducing more and more middle-class people to move back from the suburbs into the city.

There is substantial evidence that at the present time more middle-class families are moving back into the city from the suburbs, than the other way around. New York City is one of the few major cities in which this seems to be true.

There are several factors contributing to the movement of the middle-class people back into the cities. One is that we are building middle-class housing. Another is that suburban problems in some suburbs have become worse than city problems. The mushrooming growth of the suburbs has presented them with shortages of community facilities with which they cannot cope. Moreover, many of the more adventurous of the poor have been moving into suburbia, too—adding to the problems of already overburdened suburban governments. Today, suburbanization is as much a problem to the suburbanites as urbanization is to the urbanites. Indeed, these two phenomena are approaching the point of merger.

The cost of government has zoomed upward. The demand for additional city services has multiplied many times. The need for vastly expanded and radically new approaches to the problems of education, housing, traffic and crime, for instance, involve costs which are reaching beyond present tax and revenue resources available to many local governments.

Actually, New York City is ahead of most other cities both in the size of its tax base and in the extent, variety and quality of services offered, compared to those in other major cities.

In New York City our economy is a dynamic and pulsating one—full of vigor and growing power.

Last year employment topped the 1963 mark for every single month from January through November, which is the latest month for which data are available. Unemployment fell half a percentage point.

In 1964, the value of new building construction declined from 1963. But the estimated construction cost of building plans filed last year—which is the real indicator for the future—was up from \$598.2 to \$693.4 million, an increase of more than 16 percent.

Last year's retail sales totaled \$12.2 billion dollars. Our wholesale houses marketed \$45 billion worth of goods. We are incomparably the largest single manufacturing center in America. We produced 11 percent of the national total last year. In the past 10 years we have built 1,500 new factory buildings. We have over 38,000 manufacturers in New York City today, a payroll of \$5.3 billion.

New York City throbs with cultural vitality, and with social and political vitality, too. There is no city whose population groups are more self-assertive and aggressive in support of their rights—and no city with as many channels for public expressions of viewpoint, protest, or demand. There is no city

whose governmental operations are more open and available for inquiry, comment, and criticism.

The city government of New York is the second largest governmental enterprise in our country. The only larger one is the Government of the United States. Our annual budget is \$3½ billion, larger than the budgets of all but a very few countries in the world today.

I would not be so brash as to describe the city government or its services as having attained the pinnacle of perfection. We have far, far to go to reach that point. And I doubt if this government or any government made up of human beings ever will. But that is neither an excuse nor a justification for relaxing in our efforts to improve and secure improvements. There are many improvements which can and should be made. Many improvements are in the process of being made—all the time.

We in New York City and all cities are confronted with an explosion of problems. One of these is the problem of crime. Crime rates have been rising in almost every country in the world. The United States is no exception to this trend. Moreover, in the United States, the upward crime rate has occurred not only in all of the cities and suburbs, but also in the rural areas, too.

Interestingly enough, among the cities, the increase in the crime rate has been less in New York City than in most other cities. It has been going up here, too—but at a significantly lesser rate than in Los Angeles, for instance, or in Washington, D.C.

I take little comfort from relative statistics in this regard. New Yorkers are interested not in the statistics from other cities, but in the actual conditions of safety and security in the streets and subways. We are doing everything in our power and shall continue to do everything in our power in this city to grapple with this problem—with both its root causes and its manifestations.

However, the universality of the increasing crime rate must be kept in mind in our approaches to this problem as well as to other aspects of the problems of urbanization.

In New York City, our problems fall into a number of categories which include intergroup tensions; family and community disorganization; neighborhood blight—including blight of housing and neighborhood facilities; hard-core unemployment; illiteracy and lack of skills; lack of jobs for the unskilled; de facto school segregation based on de facto housing segregation; and, finally, inadequacies and shortcomings in the educational system to meet the current challenge.

This is quite an array of problems, and I haven't listed them all. Nor in this listing have I mentioned, as I did earlier, the skyrocketing cost of government.

I wonder who, in all honesty, would say that these problems are susceptible of solution by any collection by simple formulas. It is clear that since the problems originated outside the borders of the cities, the city governments cannot be expected to cope with them unaided. Indeed, the Federal Government is finally asserting its intention of coming to the aid of the cities in significant ways on a significant scale. This, I believe, is the trend of the future.

It is clear that action must be taken. The order of the day must be to attack these problems. There can be no dallying with them. Indeed, they must be attacked comprehensively and in a coordinated manner. That is one of the meanings of the war on poverty.

To meet these problems a mobilization of research, study, and scholarship has been going on for some time. I know that Long Island University has been in the forefront of these endeavors.

Study, discussion, and research into these problems must be intensified. Demonstra-

tion and pilot projects need to be expanded and increased in numbers, and the results broadly applied.

We are far from having definitive solutions to our problems. As far as the war on poverty is concerned, its overall purposes are true and clear, but its strategy and tactics remain to be fashioned and tested.

The housing problem is a critical aspect of urbanization. In New York City, the housing problem is indeed severe and critical by our own standards. Yet we in New York have shown the way to the Nation in housing—certainly in public-aided housing. Enough new housing has been constructed in New York City within the past 10 years to house the entire city of Baltimore. Today, we have substantially less substandard housing, in total number of units, than we had 10 years ago. It is still a fact, however, that 1 million New Yorkers live in substandard housing accommodations. Some of these are slums, but some are not. Nevertheless, we cannot be satisfied until there are no more slums, and no New Yorker needs to live in substandard housing.

In general, I would say that we in New York City are on top of our problems, in the sense that we are actively coping with them. We are overcoming some of them. This is neither the place nor the occasion for me to go into further detail. I would say, however, that I would be glad to have New York City's record in this regard compared with that of any other major city in the United States or in the world.

In addition to having more of almost everything than any other city, including problems, we also have more critics—and they have incomparable facilities for expressing themselves.

Let me turn from the negative to the positive, and from New York City to all cities—from the particular to the general.

The challenge to find the answers posed by urbanization is a universal one. Urbanization is probably the greatest revolution of our era. It is closely related to the worldwide social revolution in which we are gripped. It reflects, as I said before, a great world tidal wave. The World Health Organization calls it the population imposition. It is a bursting inward, rather than outward. This implies that a force has been released. Indeed it has. The problem is to capture and manage that force, and to channel it into constructive purposes.

It has been said that the city is the mirror of civilization. The writer Wolf Schneider in his book "The City as Man's Fate," wrote recently: "Man has built the city as a tremendously enlarged image of himself. The city is as good and as bad as he is."

The city is still the meeting place for minds and ideas. It is the radiation post for most communications—mass and nonmass.

The description given our cities by some critics is one of decay, crime and poverty—conformity on the one hand and misery on the other. Actually, this is a distorted image—more of a caricature than a characterization.

Of course, the cities are overwhelmed with new problems. But solutions will be found. Progress will be made. I wouldn't be trying to stretch 12 years as Mayor of New York into 16 years if I weren't full of hope and resolve that this would be so.

An old friend of mine, Charles Abrams, in a recent book entitled, "Man's Struggle for Shelter In An Urbanizing World," put it rather well. I quote his paragraph:

"The city that cradled freedom in the older industrial areas may yet cradle it in the new. But the city with its privations, its poverty, homelessness, and overcrowding also offers more dangers today than in the past. Time is essential if the institutions which the city reinforces are not to weaken, and if today's masses are not to become tomorrow's mobs."

At stake are the fate of the emerging societies, the freedoms they might help nourish and sustain, and the peaceful progress of nations within their own borders."

Five hundred years ago, William Shakespeare wrote, "The people are the city." Yes, they are. In undertaking to resolve the problems of the city, we need to resolve the problems of the people.

This is our supreme challenge and our purpose.

Our Heritage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN B. ANDERSON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 11, 1965

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, in November 1963, the city of Rockford, Ill., held a communitywide Thanksgiving program. To see a large city and its residents joined in a public display of thanksgiving was indeed an inspiration for all who participated and observed the program.

Mr. John W. Grimes, then editor of the Rockford Morning Star newspaper, now retired, wrote the narrative for a dramatic and musical production entitled "Our Heritage," which set the tone for the program. Over 500 persons were involved in this single production.

Mr. Grimes' narrative has just been awarded a 1964 Freedoms Foundation Medal. Therefore, it is indeed a privilege, Mr. Speaker, to ask the Members to read and contemplate this moving review of our history and the promise it holds for our future.

The narrative follows:

OUR HERITAGE

In the bone-chilling cold of a winter dawn, a little ship stood at anchor off the New England coast. Its patched sails drooped in their rigging like the wings of a tired bird. It was not a pretty ship nor a romantic ship as it rode into the slow swell of the ocean, utterly weary from the long voyage.

It was not a ship of discovery nor a ship of conquest. No flags or pennons greeted the sunrise. It was solitary in these uncharted waters. Behind it were leagues of wintry sea; before it lay a cold and unknown land.

But had you been able to listen, you would have heard from the cramped and dingy space below decks the plaintive tune of a thanksgiving hymn. And you would have heard a prayer of thankfulness uttered over a table sparsely laid with food: "For these mercies, Lord, we thank Thee."

Though weathered by the long and dangerous voyage, its sails discolored by salt and storm, its rigging raveled, the *Mayflower* was a beautiful ship that morning, glorified by those prayers of thanksgiving that rose from devout hearts.

And the *Mayflower* became a beautiful ship in our national story, white of wing, and fleet on the water, a symbol of people voyaging to a new land, a free land, a fair land, and raising their voices to God for His mercies and bounties.

Countless *Mayflowers* have made their voyages to America's shores and anchored in myriad ports. Across the centuries, countless pilgrims, seeking freedom and opportunity and the right to worship according to conscience, have seen breaking day reveal a new land—this beautiful America. And countless hearts have raised prayers of thanksgiving for

a safe passage and the promise held out by America.

Whether the date of its sailing from an old world be remote or recent, a *Mayflower*, a Pilgrim ship, a ship with its bow set toward freedom, is in the heritage of each of us. So we are all joined together in a congregation of thanksgiving, a thankful and devout nation, remembering alike the mercies of God and the sacred place our forefathers gave to the worship of God.

Speaking of his nation, in Bible times, the Psalmist wrote, "God is in the midst of her; she shall not be moved."

From America's earliest history, God has been in our midst. Our greatest leaders have prayed to Him for guidance. General Washington, in the snow at Valley Forge, prayed in anguish when the fortunes of a new republic were at ebb. Lincoln, in the long night vigils, prayed when he awaited dispatches from the battlefields. As a Nation, in the torture of Pearl Harbor, we prayed.

In our charters of Government, in our State papers, in the proclamations of our statesmen, we recognize the presence of God in our nationhood.

Each November, we set aside a day of Thanksgiving. There is no conflict here between church and State. By common consent, our Nation offers its thanks to God for His Goodness. As a Nation, we "enter into His gates with thanksgiving and into His courts with praise." Thanksgiving Day is an observance not of victories, not of proud events in our history, but of that sacred tie to God's providence which has been part of our national life from the beginning of our history.

"God is in the midst of us," in our churches, our cathedrals, our temples; God is in the midst of us in our striving to make ours a better land.

Our country won its political freedom in a long and cruel war, the American Revolution. Fifes shrilled and drums beat as the Continentals, in nondescript garb, assembled to learn the rudiments of military skill to give battle for liberty. But hunger, anguishing cold, division, frustration, even treachery, marked the course of these long years of war. Human fortitude needed the sustaining power of God's hand; human sorrow needed His comfort. Men prayed, and it was as if their words addressed to God became the building blocks of a great temple memorializing our faith in God.

It was not poetic fancy that had inscribed on the Liberty Bell a verse from the Bible, "Proclaim Liberty." That verse from Leviticus was in the deep music of the bell as it spoke in courageous challenge when the Declaration of Independence was signed, and spoke again in solemn triumph after the surrender of Cornwallis at Yorktown.

The sacrifices and suffering of that war had deepened America's faith in God, and at a divinely propitious time. The statesmen of a young Nation were meeting in convention to give constitutional form to the kind of government we should have. And the pioneers were already on the march across the mountains to lay claim to the fair land that was now our heritage and our responsibility.

Our deepened faith made us a God-fearing country. That faith worked in the convention to give us a constitution that made our government of the people, by the people, for the people. It worked in the westward march of a young Nation to make our goal more than the appeasing of hunger for land and wealth; to make our goal the creation of an American civilization.

In the halls where our charters of government were written, in the little wagon trains crossing the eastern mountains, we learned that freedom under God has responsibilities. Because we were a God-fearing people, neither the oligarch in government nor the marauder on the frontier took command of

our fortunes. Our land, our future, our destiny lay before us to be trusted wisely or to be wasted. We learned restraint, and we learned that true democracy of working together.

The pioneers who marched westward sought farms and homes and shops. They brought their skills, their inventions, their diligence. Their homespun goal was an orderly and productive life. Their dream was a culture available to all men. They built schools and academies for their children and laid deep and lasting foundations for education. Scholarship flowed westward in an increasing stream. Libraries and lyceums flourished. And colleges to which unsung and dedicated scholars gave their lives sprang up in such numbers that no ambitious youth was more than a day's horseback ride from academic groves.

But always, there were churches, rude and humble in their beginnings, but rising in a thousand spires as men paid their tithe to God. They were the symbols of God in the midst of us.

But there grew up a great division among the States. Debate became more angry. A solution in debate failed and our Nation was involved in civil war.

Our very nationhood was put to the test. There were prayerful men and God-fearing men on each side of the battle line. We look back on that cruel war from the vantage point of a hundred years, and we have occasion to give thanks that the wounds were bound up. Because there were God-fearing men on both sides, we were spared the horror of a war without conscience. Out of the crucible of civil war, war between brothers, came the word of Lincoln's Second Inaugural address: "With firmness in the right as God gives us to see the right."

Those words carried us through the chaotic Reconstruction days. God was still in the midst of us, giving vision to those who sought His guidance. What Lincoln gave us in those words was a new theme of social righteousness. Not social justice, which smacks of legalism, nor a social gospel which seeks to impose its dictate, but social righteousness which wells up in the God-fearing individual when he seeks God's guidance and fits his life to that inner chart.

Lincoln's words are with us today as we face new problems which cannot be solved by compulsion or in anger, but as we are firm in the right as God gives us to see the right.

The Prophet Micah said that God's requirements were these: that we deal justly, love mercy, and walk humbly with our God.

Our great thanksgiving in this year and hour must be for that precious heritage of a God-fearing land. And our great avowal must be that we continue as a God-fearing people.

We are all voyagers, pilgrims, explorers, looking to the future. As the mists rise, we see revealed the shores of a great land. The once bleak coast now rises in towers. Inland, a fair country stretches away rich with churches, homes, farmsteads, schools, industrial plants, railroads, and highways. There are myriad cities with parks and playgrounds—and great halls of culture and the arts.

This is our land; the land God-fearing people built by keeping their faces turned toward the light. This is the heritage courage and toll and prayer and self-discipline have given us.

Our prayer of thanksgiving should be joined to a prayer of new dedication. Our heritage shall not be lost. This faith that God will stand in the midst of us, as we meet new problems, shall not be abandoned.

God guided us as a nation toward ideals of education and culture and for that concord of high purpose which alone can make us act as good citizens for the common good.

A1142

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

March 11, 1965

Lord God of Hosts, be with us yet, lest we forget, lest we forget.

We offer our thanks and we make our avowal. Our land shall not be less beautiful for our having lived in it. Its dream shall not be less because we fail to have vision. Its faith in God shall not diminish because we abandon faith. God is in the midst of us. We shall not be moved.

Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 11, 1965

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to bring to the attention of my colleagues an article on the recently published State Department white paper on Vietnam.

The following article appeared in the I. F. Stone's Weekly for March 9, 1965:

[From I. F. Stone's Weekly, Mar. 9, 1965]

A REPLY TO THE WHITE PAPER

That North Vietnam supports the guerrillas in South Vietnam is no more a secret than that the United States supports the South Vietnamese Government against them. The striking thing about the State Department's new white paper is how little support it can prove. "Incontrovertible evidence of Hanoi's elaborate program to supply its forces in the south with weapons, ammunition, and other supplies," the white paper says, "has accumulated over the years." A detailed presentation of this evidence is in appendix D; unfortunately few will see the appendixes since even the New York Times did not reprint them, though these are more revealing than the report. Appendix D provides a list of weapons, ammunition, and other supplies of Chinese Communist, Soviet, Czechoslovak, and North Vietnamese manufacture, with the dates and place of capture from the Vietcong guerrillas, over the 18-month period from June 1962 to January 29 last year when it was presented to the International Control Commission. The Commission was set up by the Geneva agreement of 1954. This list provides a good point at which to begin an analysis of the white paper.

THE PENTAGON FIGURES

To put the figures in perspective, we called the Pentagon press office and obtained some figures the white paper does not supply—the number of weapons captured from the guerrillas and the number lost to them in recent years:

	Captured from guerrillas	Lost to them
Year 1962-----	4,800	5,200
Year 1963-----	5,400	8,500
Year 1964-----	4,900	13,700
3-year total...	15,100	27,400

In 3 years, the guerrillas captured from our side 12,300 more weapons than they lost to us.

What interests us at the moment is not this favorable balance but the number of guerrilla weapons our side captured during the past 3 years. The grand total was 15,100. If Hanoi has indeed engaged in an "elaborate program" to supply the Vietcong, one would expect a substantial number of enemy-produced weapons to turn up. Here is the sum total of enemy-produced weapons and supplies in that 18-month tally to the Control Commission: 72 rifles (46 Soviet, 26 Czech); 64 submachineguns (40 Czech, 24 French but "modified" in North Vietnam); 15 car-

bines (Soviet); 8 machineguns (6 Chinese, 2 North Vietnamese); 5 pistols (4 Soviet, 1 Czech); 4 mortars (Chinese); 3 recoilless 75-millimeter rifles (Chinese); 3 recoilless 57-millimeter guns (Chinese); 2 bazookas (1 Chinese, 1 Czech); 2 rocket launchers (Chinese); and 1 grenade launcher (Czech) for a total of 179.

This is not a very impressive total. According to the Pentagon figures, we captured on the average 7,500 weapons each 18 months in the past 3 years. If only 179 Communist-made weapons turned up in 18 months, that is less than 2½ percent of the total. Judging by these white paper figures, our military are wrong in estimating, as they have in recent months, that 80 percent of the weapons used by the guerrillas are captured from us. It looks as if the proportion is considerably higher. The material of North Vietnamese origin included only those 24 French submachineguns "modified" in North Vietnam, 2 machineguns made in North Vietnam, 16 helmets, a uniform, and an undisclosed number of mess kits, belts, sweaters, and socks. Judging by this tally, the main retaliatory blow should be at North Vietnam's clothing factories.

NOT ENOUGH FOR A BATTALION

There is another way to judge this tally of captured Communist weapons. A Communist battalion has about 450 men. It needs 500 rifles, four 80-millimeter mortars, eight 60-millimeter mortars, and at least 4 recoilless rifles. The weapons of Communist origin captured in 18 months would not adequately outfit one battalion. The figures in the appendix on ammunition captured provides another index. We captured 183 (Chinese) shells for a 60-millimeter mortar. This fires about 20 shells a minute, so that was hardly enough ammunition for 10 minutes of firing. There were 100,000 (Chinese) cartridges for 7.26-millimeter machineguns. That looks impressive until one discovers on checking with knowledgeable military sources that these machineguns fire 800 rounds a minute. A machinegun platoon normally has four machineguns. This was enough ammunition for about 40 minutes of firing by one platoon. Indeed, if the ratio of Communist-made weapons captured is the same for weapons used, then only 12½ days of those 18 months were fought by the guerrillas on the basis of Communist-made supplies.

If these figures were being presented in a court of law, they would run up against a further difficulty: one would have to prove the arms actually came from the Communist side. There is a worldwide market in second-hand weapons. One can buy Soviet, Czech, and Chinese Communist weapons of all kinds only 2 miles or so from the Pentagon at Interarmco, Ltd., 7 Prince Street, Alexandria, Va. Interarmco, one of the world's foremost dealers, can provide more Communist weapons than we picked up in 18 months on Vietnamese battlefields. Interarmco's East European Communist weapons come in large part from the huge stocks of Soviet and Czech arms captured by the Israelis in the Suez campaign. It has Chinese Communist weapons captured by our side in the Korean war. It also has, of course, a wide selection of our own military surplus. This has turned up in strange places.

For example, a book on the Algerian war, "Les Algériens en guerre," by Dominique Darbois and Philippe Vingneau, was published in Milan in 1960 by Feltrinelli. It shows pictures of FLN (National Liberation Front) Algerian rebels wearing U.S. Marine Corps uniforms from which the "USM" and the eagle and globe insignia have not even been removed. It shows Algerians carrying U.S. 80-millimeter mortars and U.S. 50-caliber machineguns. Such photos could have been used by France to accuse the United States of supplying the Algerian rebels.

The State Department's white paper says

"dramatic new proof was exposed just as this report was being completed" in the discovery of a suspected Vietcong arms cargo ship on February 16. The New York Times commented astringently on this in an editorial February 28:

"Apparently, the major new evidence of a need for escalating the war, with all the hazard that this entails, was provided by the sinking in a South Vietnamese cove earlier this month of a 100-ton cargo ship loaded with Communist-made small arms and ammunition. A ship of that size is not much above the oriental junk class. The standard Liberty or Victory ship of World War II had a capacity of 7,150 to 7,650 tons."

The affair of the cargoship is curious. Until now there has been little evidence of arms coming in by ship. A huge fleet of small vessels patrols the coast and there have been glowing stories in the past of its efficiency. "About 12,000 vessels," the AP reported from Saigon (New York Times, Feb. 23) "are searched each month by the South Vietnamese coastal junk patrol force but arrests are rare and no significant amounts of incriminating goods or weapons ever have been found." This lone case of a whole shipload of arms is puzzling.

NEW NORTHERN INFILTRATES CITED

The white paper's story on the influx of men from the north also deserves a closer analysis than the newspapers have given it. Appendix C provides an elaborate table from 1959-60 to 1964 inclusive, showing the number of "confirmed military infiltrates per year from the north. The total is given as 19,550. One way to measure this number is against that of the military we have assigned to South Vietnam in the same years. These now total 23,500, or 25 percent more, and 1,000 are to be added in the near future. The number of North Vietnamese infiltrates is "based on information * * * from at least two independent sources." Nowhere are we told how many men who infiltrated from the North have actually been captured. There is reason to wonder whether the count of infiltrates may be as bloated as the count of Vietcong dead; in both cases the numbers used are estimates rather than actual bodies.

The white paper calls the war an invasion and claims "that as many as 75 percent of the more than 4,400 Vietcong who are known to have entered the South in the first 8 months of 1964 were natives of North Vietnam. But a careful reading of the text and the appendixes turns up the names of only six North Vietnamese infiltrates. In part I of the white paper, section B gives "individual case histories of North Vietnamese soldiers sent south by Hanoi but all nine of these are of South Vietnamese origin. The next section, C, is headed "Infiltration of Native North Vietnamese." It names five infiltrates but one of these is also from the south. That leaves four North Vietnamese natives. Then, in appendix C, we are given the case histories and photographs of nine other Vietcong sent south by Hanoi. The report does not explain which ones were originally from the South but it does give the names of Provinces in which they were born. When these are checked, it turns out that only two of the nine were born in North Vietnam. This gives us a total of six northern infiltrates. It is strange that after 5 years of fighting, the white paper can cite so few.

None of this is discussed frankly in the white paper. To do so would be to bring the war into focus as a rebellion in the South, which may owe some men and materiel to the North but is largely dependent on popular indigenous support for its manpower, as it is on captured U.S. weapons for its supply. The white paper withholds all evidence which points to a civil war. It also fails to tell the full story of the July 1962 special report by the International Control Commission. Appendix A quotes that portion in which the Commission, 2 to 1 (Poland dis-

sending) declared that the North had in specific instances sent men and material south in violation of the Geneva accords. But nowhere does the State Department mention that the same report also condemned South Vietnam and the United States, declaring that they had entered into a military alliance in violation of the Geneva agreements. The United States was criticized because it then had about 5,000 military advisers in South Vietnam. The Geneva accords limited the United States military mission to the 684 in Vietnam at the time of the 1954 ceasefire. The United States and South Vietnam were also criticized by the ICC for hamstringing the Commission's efforts to check on imports of arms in violation of the Geneva accords.

The reader would never guess from the white paper that the Geneva accords promised that elections would be held in 1956 to reunify the country. The 1961 blue book at least mentioned the elections, though somehow managing to make them seem a plot. "It was the Communists' calculation," the blue book put it, "that nationwide elections scheduled in the accords for 1956 would turn all of South Vietnam over to them. The authorities in South Vietnam refused to fall into this well-laid trap." The white paper omits mention of the elections altogether and says, "South Vietnam's refusal to fall in with Hanoi's scheme for peaceful takeover came as a heavy blow to the Communists." This is not the most candid and objective presentation. From the Viet Minh point of view, the failure to hold the elections promised them when they laid down their arms was the second broken promise of the West. The earlier one was in 1945 when they made an agreement to accept limited autonomy within the French union, and welcomed the returning French troops as comrades of the liberation. Most of the French military did not want to recognize even this limited form of independence, and chose instead the road which led after 8 years of war to Dienbienphu.

THAT ECONOMIC MIRACLE AGAIN

The most disingenuous part of the white paper is that in which it discusses the origins of the present war. It pictures the war as an attack from the north, launched in desperation because the "economic miracle" in the south under Diem had destroyed Communist hopes of a peaceful takeover from within. Even the strategic hamlets are described as "designed to improve the peasant's livelihood" and we are asked to believe that for the first time in history a guerrilla war spread not because the people were discontented but because their lot was improving.

The true story is a story of lost opportunities. The Communist countries acquiesced in the failure to hold elections. Diem had a chance to make his part of the country a democratic showcase. The year 1956 was a bad one in the north. There was a peasant uprising and widespread resentment among the intellectuals over the Communist Party's heavyhanded thought control. But Diem on the other side of the 17th parallel was busy erecting a dictatorship of his own. In 1956 he abolished elections even for village councils. In 1957 his mobs smashed the press of the one legal opposition, the Democratic Bloc, when it dared criticize the Government. That was the beginning of a campaign to wipe out every form of opposition. It was this campaign and the oppressive exactions imposed on the peasantry, the fake land reform, and the concentration camps Diem set up for political opponents of all kinds, which stirred ever-wider rebellion from 1958 onward in the grassroots before North Vietnam gave support. It was this which drove oppositionists of all kinds into alliance with the Communists in the national liberation front.

Long before the north was accused of interference, its Government was complaining to the Control Commission of "border and airspace violations by the south and infringe-

ments of the Geneva agreement by the introduction of arms and U.S. servicemen." For 4 years after Geneva, both North Vietnam and China followed the "peaceful coexistence" policy while the United States turned South Vietnam into a military base and a military dictatorship. It is in this story the white paper does not tell, and the popular discontent it does not mention, that the rebellion and the aid from the north had their origins.

Speech Delivered by the Honorable Sylvester J. Garamella, National President of the Italian Executives of America, Inc., on the Occasion of the Anniversary of the Birth of Amerigo Vespucci

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JOHN J. ROONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 10, 1965

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, yesterday evening, March 9, 1965, I had the great honor of being the guest of the Italian Executives of America, Inc., at a dinner commemorating the 511th anniversary of the birth of the great hero and explorer, Amerigo Vespucci.

A very interesting and stirring speech was delivered at the dinner by the Honorable Sylvester J. Garamella, national president of the Italian Executives of America, Inc. Under the permission heretofore granted me by unanimous consent of the House, I include herewith Commissioner Garamella's remarks:

ADDRESS OF HON. SYLVESTER J. GARAMELLA

As national president of the Italian Executives of America, I want, at the very outset, to congratulate Elio Grande, who has so capably spearheaded the organization of the District of Columbia chapter information of the "Executives"—and arranged this fine dinner tonight. To you, and to your fine membership, Elio, I say "Benvenuti." I know that you will lend great credit to us all and that your chapter will grow in numbers, and that it will become one of the bulwarks of our organization—helping us to carry out our aim to "present the true image of 22 million Italo-Americans in the United States to the public through all media of communication."

Our organization is a nonpartisan one, comprised of executives, whose membership is open to anyone, Italian or not, of any political persuasion, who is interested in helping us communicate this true image to the American public.

In considering what I would say this evening, I thought of many topics and subjects. Somehow one kept predominating in my mind. I certainly wanted to talk about our "Executives," but I kept seeing the panorama of our President's program for the creation of our Great Society—I remembered the Renaissance and began comparing it to the Great Society—I will now, therefore, for just a few moments, discuss with you "Lyndon Baines Johnson—the master architect of the Renaissance in the 20th century."

As you know, the Renaissance was the rebirth of the Golden Age of humanism and the arts. It began in Italy, the cradle of civilization and the seat of the Old Roman Empire. It then spread throughout all of Europe. A spirit of general elevation and enlightenment was created and a happier

era resulted, productive of such great personalities, as Leonardo Da Vinci, Buonarroti Michelangelo, Nicolo Macchiavelli, Della Robbia, Raphael, Francesco Petrarca, Benvenuto Cellini, Galileo, Pope Julius II, and many, many others.

It was a rich period which influenced art, philosophy, science, government, the professions, religion and ecclesiastical law. Great changes in the mode of living and civilization were brought about in all of Europe. The best thoughts were produced—learning was respected, commerce flourished, many wonderful books were written, and great art masterpieces were created. Creative skill indeed marched forward.

The Renaissance began by looking backward into the past and before long it was looking forward into the future. A bridge was created between the Middle Ages and modern times.

How do we now compare all of this to the present-day efforts of our President—Lyndon Baines Johnson—who has looked into our present and is creating a bridge to our future?

Just as a new Christian civilization resulted from the pioneering spirit of the Renaissance, so will the pioneering spirit of the Chief Executive—the architect of the Renaissance of the 20th century—lead us to a better way of life—with a distinct difference, however.

The Renaissance did not touch the common people, the working masses, the poor and the needy. It considered only the nobility and the aristocracy.

On the other hand the Great Society touches everyone—the rich and the poor alike, the lowly, the uneducated, the ill housed, the sick, and those at the very top of the ladder of success.

It is the first truly Great Society—complete society—touching the lives of the most humble and of the greatest—with opportunity for everyone—the right to a job, to a decent living wage, to proper medical care, to assistance in old age, to comfortable housing—where the children of the poorest artisans have an opportunity for education—where all of society is enriched without regard to race, color, or creed—where we will enjoy a fluorescence in art, literature, music, and the sciences.

Where do the Italian executives of America now fit into this panorama of the Great Society? We are, if you will, a segment, a symbol of the 22 million Americans of Italian heritage in the United States—the largest ethnic minority in our country—a minority which has helped to build our railroads, mined our coal for industry, and helped in so many ways to bring this land to the status it enjoys today—which has produced men in government of whom we can all be proud—men such as we honored today at the Italian Embassy when the executives presented this tablet to His Excellency, Ambassador Sergio Fenoaltea—39 Italian-American Congressmen, living and dead, representing all political parties since Frances B. Spinola who served from 1887–91—all men of distinction and dedicated to service who discharged their stewardship in office with credit to themselves and their heritage. Leading the list is Hon. JOHN O. PASTORE, U.S. Senator from Rhode Island, who only recently distinguished himself as the keynote speaker at a national convention, who electrified the country with his dynamic oratory before the television cameras in that jam-packed auditorium—I would like to read the names on this tablet:

JOHN O. PASTORE, of Rhode Island; JOSEPH P. ADDABBO, of New York; Hugh J. Addonizio, of New Jersey; Victor L. Anfuso, of New York; F. ANNUNZIO, of Illinois; Anthony Caminetti of California; Louis J. Capozzoli, of New York; Anthony Cavalcante, of Pennsylvania; Peter A. Caviochia, of New Jersey; Louis Gary Clemente, of New York; Silvio O. Conte, of Massachusetts; Albert Cretella, of Connecticut.

A1144

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

cut; EMILIO Q. DADDARIO, of Connecticut; Thomas D'Alesandro, Jr., of Maryland; DOMINICK V. DANIELS, of New Jersey; JOHN H. DENT, of Pennsylvania; George A. Dondero, of Michigan; DANTE B. FASCELL, of Florida; PAUL A. FINE, of New York; and Foster Furcolo, of Massachusetts.

ROBERT N. GLAIMO, of Connecticut; Peter C. Granata, of Illinois; Fiorello La Guardia, of New York; James J. Lanzetta, of New York; ROBERT LEGGETT, of California; Roland V. Libonati, of Illinois; Vito Marcantonio, of New York; GEORGE P. MILLER, of California; JOSEPH G. MINISH, of New Jersey; Albert P. Morano, of Connecticut; Vincent L. Palmisano, of Maryland; PETER W. RODINO, Jr., of New Jersey; TENO RONCALIO, of Wyoming; Alfred E. Santangelo, of New York; James P. Scoblick, of Pennsylvania; CARLTON J. SICKLES, of Maryland; Francis P. Spinola, of New York; Anthony F. Tauriello, of New York; and J. V. VIGORITO, of Pennsylvania.

Today is the 511th anniversary of the birth of a great Italian—Amerigo Vespucci—who was the first to sight Cape Canaveral—now Cape Kennedy, from which our space explorations are so successfully being conducted—under the aegis of our National Aeronautical Space Administration and the guidance of our President, and where new horizons are constantly being achieved.

The Great Society will, also under the guidance of Lyndon Baines Johnson, carry us to new horizons in living—the master architect of this Renaissance in our century can expect to find support, inspiration, and cooperation from Italo-Americans throughout the country and from organizations such as ours.

I am sure that when the story of our future is eventually written in the pages of history, that the Italian-Americans will have acquitted themselves with honor, ability, and dedication.

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

TITLE 44, SECTION 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the RECORD without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer shall arrange the contents of the daily RECORD as follows: the Senate proceedings shall alternate with the House proceedings in order of placement in consecutive issues insofar as such an arrangement is feasible, and the Appendix and Daily Digest shall follow: *Provided*, That the makeup of the RECORD shall proceed without regard to alternation whenever the Public Printer deems it necessary in order to meet production and delivery schedules.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and de-

bates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the RECORD shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentations be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p.m. in order to insure publication in the RECORD issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the RECORD for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the RECORD of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the RECORD shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p.m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the RECORD style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. _____ addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the RECORD.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided*, That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent RECORD is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided*, That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further*, That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10(a). *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Mem-

ber, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided*, That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the sine die adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

10(b). *Makeup of the Appendix.*—The Appendix to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD shall be made up by successively taking first an extension from the copy submitted by the Official Reporters of one House and then an extension from the copy of the other House, so that Senate and House extensions appear alternately as far as possible throughout the Appendix. The sequence for each House shall follow as closely as possible the order or arrangement in which the copy comes from the Official Reporters of the respective Houses.

The Official Reporters of each House shall designate and distinctly mark the lead item among their extensions. When both Houses are in session and submit extensions, the lead item shall be changed from one House to the other in alternate issues, with the indicated lead item of the other House appearing in second place. When only one House is in session, the lead item shall be an extension submitted by a Member of the House in session.

This rule shall not apply to extensions withheld because of volume or equipment limitations, which shall be printed immediately following the lead items as indicated by the Official Reporters in the next issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, nor to RECORDS printed after the sine die adjournment of the Congress.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).